THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

Volume 19 February, 1937 Number 2

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Sir Stafford Cripps R. Palme Dutt

W. J. R. Squance Mrs. Corbett Ashby

and

Harry L. Self

on

PROBLEMS OF UNITY

AND

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

Lenin's Letters Nehru on India

Book Reviews

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

ALL-DAY NATIONAL DELEGATE

Discussion Conference

ON

THE PROBLEMS OF UNITY

AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

WILL TAKE PLACE

ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 14th, 1937

11 a.m. to 1 p.m., 2 p.m. to 6 p.m.

BATTERSEA TOWN HALL, Lavender Hill, S.W.11

(Buses 77, 77a, and Trams 26, 28 pass the door)

Chairman: R. PALME DUTT.

Opening Speakers:

Prof. HAROLD J. LASKI, G. D. H. COLE, HARRY ADAMS

(London Divisional Secretary, A.U.B.T.W.)

The Object of the Conference is to provide an open forum for the free and unfettered exchange of views on such urgent questions as:—

(1) Working-Class Unity.

(2) Rearmament, War and Peace.

(3) The Question of The People's Front in Britain.

The Conference will be open to delegates from all Labour, Trade Union, Co-operative, Democratic and Peace organisations. A fee of 1/- per delegate will be charged towards defraying the expenses. *Visitors will be welcome.* (6d. each).

There still may be time to get your organisation represented. If it has not yet recieved an invitation ACT AT ONCE and write us and we will immediately dispatch a copy direct.

Offers of **Hospitality** for delegates from outside the London area desiring it, either on Saturday or Sunday, will be welcomed from readers.

Write for full details to:

The Manager, The Labour Monthly, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 19 FEBRUARY, 1937 NUMBER 2

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

In Memory of Ralph Fox - - - - - Page 66
By R. PALME DUTT

Notes of the Month - - - - - - ,, 67
THE UNITY CAMPAIGN
By R. P. D.

Problems of Unity and the People's Front

United Front - - - - - - - ,, 78
By SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS

Towards Unity - - - - - - - ,, 83
By W. J. R. SQUANCE

Unity or Disruption - - - - - - ,, 86
By HARRY L. SELF

The People's Front - - - - - - ,, 89
MARGERY CORBETT ASHBY

The Problem of the Distressed Areas (*Concluded*) ,, 93
By WAL HANNINGTON

Presidential Address to the Indian National Congress at Faizpur - - - - - - - ,, 98
By JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

Selected Letters, II. - - - - - - - ,, 108
By V. I. LENIN

Book Reviews - - - - - - - ,, 117
Mutiny in History - - - - - - - - *By* T. C.
A Faulty Study of De Valera - - - - *By* Brian O'Neill
Zionism and its Friends - - - - *By* Leslie Hutchinson
Ancient Greek Materialism - - - - - - *By* G. T.
The Countryside Speaks - - - - - *By* A. J. W.

The Financial Appeal - - - - - - ,, 127

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Memory of Ralph Fox

The LABOUR MONTHLY *unites with the whole British working-class movement and with anti-fascists all over the world in honouring the memory of Ralph Fox, who fell in the fight against fascism in Spain on January 3rd.*

Ralph Fox was a deeply valued contributor to the LABOUR MONTHLY. *His contributions on Trade Union Unity in France, on British Imperialism in China, and on the relation of Imperialism and Fascism, will be remembered. The rôle of his tireless activity in the working-class movement, as a member of the Communist Party from its foundation, no less than of his books and writings, which covered a very wide range and were devoted to the spreading of Marxist-Leninist understanding, has won the recognition and tributes of all sections of the working-class movement. His imaginative writings won the appreciation of lovers of literature across the channels of political difference. His personality, modesty and sincerity won the affection of all who met him.*

The loss of Ralph Fox, as of so many of the best and bravest in this struggle let loose by fascism, is a heavy loss. It will fill all with redoubled fury against the fascist barbarism that has cut short the life and productive activity of one who had still so much to give the world. But at the same time it will fill all with deep pride and emulation at the example he has set of an English revolutionary fighter, and with redoubled determination to realise the victory of the cause for which he gave his life.

May this example sink deep for the younger generation of writers and artists, of one who knew how to think, to feel, to live and to die in integral devotion to his ideals, as a soldier of humanity.

Through the blood and travail of the present time a new and deeper revolutionary movement is growing up in Britain on the foundation of the old, a revolutionary movement whose character and whose sacrifices constitute the guarantee of future victory. In the building of this revolutionary movement in Britain, Ralph Fox, and those who have fallen with him in Spain, will hold an honoured place.

R. PALME DUTT.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

The Unity Campaign—Hold Firm!—Class Unity, not Sectional Unity—The "Left Bloc" Myth—Unity within the Labour Party—Whose "Windy Verbiage?"—The "Closed Question" Principle—Discipline and Discipline—From One Twentieth to One Third—Mechanical Discipline or Harmonious Evolution—Unity and the Labour Party—Basis of Labour Party — Post-War Opposition to Unity — MacDonald's Rôle—Through Disruption to Defeat—New Awakening—The Next Step Forward — The Two Alternatives

ALL the questions of the future of the working-class movement and of socialism in this country, no less than the most urgent questions of current politics, are raised by the Unity Campaign which has now been launched under the auspices of the Socialist League, the Independent Labour Party and the Communist Party, together with supporters of unity in the main body of the Labour Party and Trade Unionism. This new initiative is the most important forward step for many years in the British Labour Movement. It has come none too soon. In an hour of extreme urgency of the international situation, no less than of deep inner crisis of the British Labour Movement since Edinburgh, a supreme effort is being made to save and rally the fight, and to realise unity of all the working-class forces, trade unionist, co-operative, socialist and communist, for the common struggle which faces us all. It is not only a supreme opportunity, but in all probability *the last chance* before the consequences of disunity lead to their final deadly outcome and compel the ultimate forging of unity under heavy conditions. Therefore it is to be hoped that every socialist and trade unionist, knowing what is at stake, will give serious and unprejudiced consideration to the proposals put forward.

ATTEMPTS have been made, in official quarters hostile to working-class unity, to create prejudice against the campaign beforehand and to burke free discussion of the issues by disciplinary threats,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even before the campaign existed and before its proposals had been formulated. This extraordinary procedure, this daily deluge of propaganda for weeks beforehand against a still non-existent campaign, these fiery threats of immediate execution against a baby still unborn, are only a measure of official fears and a tribute to the strength of mass feeling on this issue. The supporters of disunity in this country, knowing the significance of the step proposed, knowing the feeling of the main body of the workers on this question (as a referendum of the local labour parties and trade union membership would rapidly show), have poured out their threats in anticipation and constituted themselves advance publicity agents of the campaign. Thereby they have only revealed their fear. *They fear the class unity of the workers as the devil fears holy water.* They are throwing out their thunderbolts and threats of excommunication like German Social Democracy of old. We are confident that in so doing they are not only revealing their deadly blindness to the real urgencies of our our time, but they are gravely under-estimating the real temper of the movement to-day. The present stage is no longer the stage of ten years ago, of MacDonald and before Hitler. Too many are realising to-day what is at stake. The menace of turning what should be a democratic discussion of policy into a question of discipline and disruption is great ; but it can be defeated. To the entire working-class movement we would say at this moment : *Hold firm ! Allow no disruption of the ranks ! The present testing is as serious for us at this moment as any future direct fight against Fascism.*

ALL the attempts to burke discussion of the Unity Campaign by disciplinary threats are based on two false propositions. The first is that the Unity Campaign is misrepresented and distorted as a proposed " left bloc " or " united front of left wing organisations " endeavouring to form a rival camp in opposition to the main body of the Labour Movement organised in the Labour Party and trade unions. Therefore what is in reality a movement to strengthen and unite the entire Labour Movement on the basis of the Labour Party and trade unions is falsely presented as a disruptionist movement. This misrepresentation could not survive a single careful reading of the Unity Manifesto. The rôle of the three political organisations of socialist opinion and agitation in uniting with other elements in the Labour Party and trade unions to promote this campaign is solely an *initiating* rôle.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the *objective* of the campaign is to build up the unity of all the working class forces, from left to right, within the Labour Party, in order to carry forward the immediate fight of the working class and to lead the way to the victory of the Labour Party and a Labour Government representative of the united working class. Any tendency to separatism on the left would be a disaster. *The aim of the campaign is specifically directed to oppose and seek to prevent tendencies to breakaways on the left, no less than disruptive measures on the right.* It seeks to strengthen the Labour Party, to unite all working-class forces in the Labour Party, to develop its fighting programme and revitalise and democratise its working. If this is " disruption," words have no meaning. On the contrary, it is the one serious effort to save the Labour Movement from disruption, from the consequences of the disruptive policies which are being pursued with incredible lightmindedness by the present leadership.

WHAT is the " united front " which the Unity Campaign exists to promote ? Any reader of the official Labour propaganda against the campaign would draw the conclusion that the " united front " in question is one between the Socialist League, the Independent Labour Party and the Communist Party, and that the desirability or otherwise of such a united front is the whole subject of controversy. The essence of the campaign is declared by the official Labour organ to be the formation of a " Triple Alliance " (December 29, 1936) which " lines up against Labour (December 19, 1936) ; the proclaimed aim of all-inclusive unity is declared to be a mere " thick smoke-screen of unity talk " (December 21, 1936). It is obvious that this treatment deliberately turns the whole meaning and purpose of the campaign upside down. The fact that the three leading organisations of socialist opinion in this country (for the individual membership of the Labour Party has no means of registering its opinion, which would also be favourable to unity, as indeed it may in addition be noted that the Fabian Society has equally gone on record for the united front, and similarly the University Labour Federation and Labour Youth organisation—*i.e.*, every considerable socialist organisation in the country whose membership have the opportunity to record their view), the fact that these leading organisations of socialist opinion, directly descended from those which gave the lead to found the Labour Party, are now united in this further campaign to save the Labour Party from disaster and realise

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working-class unity through the Labour Party, is a significant and important fact. But the composition of the sponsors is secondary to the purpose of the campaign. The purpose of the campaign is not sectional unity, but class unity. The united front which the campaign exists to promote is the united front of the working class, the unity of all sections of the working class in the Labour Party. In this common aim the co-operation of all elements is sought. This and nothing else is the issue, and there is no excuse for attempts to conceal it.

WHEN therefore the Chairman of the Labour Party Executive, Dr. Dalton, in his reply to Professor Laski, took occasion to make the pontifical declaration:

> If there be a few, fed on the windy verbiage of "United Fronts," who are tempted to prefer a spurious unity with small forces outside the Party to a real unity with great forces within it, they must make their own choice, in full knowledge of overwhelming Conference decisions only three months old. (*Daily Herald*, January 5, 1937.)

he was manifestly playing up to this false and distorted picture of the Unity Campaign as a supposed "left bloc" in a way that completely conceals the real and serious issue of unity. Who would guess from this sanctimonious treatment, solemly chiding the left workers for tending to hive off on their own, that the whole issue turns on the demand of the left workers to realise "unity with great forces within" the Labour Party, and that it is precisely Dalton who is preventing this, and is actually in this very declaration threatening further exclusions and disruption?

AS for the "windy verbiage of united fronts," the boomerang is likely to recoil on the not altogether wordless doctor who is endeavouring to present himself as the silent man of action. The readers of the *Daily Herald* may not be allowed to know many things, but they are not so innocent as to be unaware that something more than "windy verbiage" is holding back Fascism in Spain and France, that the real "windy verbiage" of social democratic opposition to the united front was singularly ineffective in holding back Hitler, and that a little more effectiveness on the part of the British Labour leadership against Baldwin would be desirable before they take on themselves to read lectures on "windy verbiage" to those who know how to fight. "Unity with the great forces within" the Labour Party? Yes; for that we are fighting, and Dalton is leading the opposition to prevent it. But let it be added for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clearness that it is not a question of "small forces outside the Party." It is a question of the majority of the working class, who are not yet won by the Labour Party, and who can only be won by it, as the example of France has shown, when the Labour Party inscribes Unity on its banners and the impelling power of unity in action of all the organised workers draws with them the unorganised mass.

IT is further argued—and this is the second obstacle placed in the way of free discussion of the issue of unity—that the question of working-class unity cannot be re-opened or further considered, nor a campaign for it permitted, since the question has been already decided by previous Conferences of the Labour Party. Any attempt to conduct a campaign for it, and to unite in such a campaign with elements outside the Labour Party on the basis of the aim of unity within the Labour Party, would constitute a "breach of discipline"—to be treated, not as a question of policy for reasoned discussion, but as a question of discipline. The dead hand of the past is to bind and choke the living needs of the present. Even within the five days of the Edinburgh Conference the decision on Spain on the fifth day reversed the decision by the same delegates on the first day, owing to a wider understanding of the issues. Yet from the day after the Conference there is to be no further life and growth of the movement, no re-opening of issues and correction in the light of wider understanding, even though the urgency grows daily greater. This is the bureaucratic principle of the "chose jugée," of the static irrevocable decision, that favourite weapon in the arsenal of reaction, which played its historic rôle in the Dreyfus trial.

WHAT is here involved is not the correct and necessary discipline of a working-class organisation against breaches of solidarity disrupting the ranks. For the issue here is precisely the present official denial of working-class solidarity, which can alone be the basis of working-class discipline. The supposed offence against unity is the fight for unity. Discipline is to be invoked against a Cripps for associating with a Pollitt and a Maxton on the basis of loyalty to the Labour Movement, and the endeavour to unite all sections in the Labour Party. But discipline is not invoked against a Citrine for unity with a Churchill. Verily, this is to make one measure for the truly loyal patriots of the working-class movement, and another measure for traitors—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whip for the loyal and the crown for traitors. To deny working-class solidarity, and then to seek to enforce this denial in the name of working-class discipline, is to turn the meaning of discipline upside down. This is the "discipline" of a Hitler *against* working-class organisation, and the opposite of working-class discipline.

THE Labour Party Executive Manifesto issued last month against the united front, and prohibiting association of Labour Party members with "organisations which are clearly formed to pursue United Front or Popular Front activities" (at the very moment of the most urgent need of united support for the Spanish struggle) prominently recalls the vote at the Southport Conference three years ago when unity with the Communist Party was rejected by 1,820,000 to 89,000 votes. But it does not record the vote at the Edinburgh Conference three months ago, when Communist Party affiliation to the Labour Party received 592,000 votes and the united front received 435,000 votes. A three years' old vote of 89,000 is important to record with arithmetical exactitude. But a three month's old vote of over half a million disappears from view into the vague phrase "overwhelming majorities." Is it not plain to every impartial observer that this loving attention to the three years' old vote of 89,000 and convenient blind eye to the three months' old vote of over half a million is not merely a conventional piece of propagandist disingenuity, which is likely to recoil upon its authors, but actually betrays a guilty consciousness of the real heart of the issue? *For the all-important fact is precisely that the vote in the Labour Party for unity has risen in three years from* 89,000 *to close on* 600,000, *that is, has multiplied from six to seven times, has increased from less than one twentieth of the majority vote to over one third of it.* This is what reveals the real dynamic situation in the Labour Party.

THIS living situation in the Labour Party has the closest bearing on the question of discipline. The movement for unity is sweeping through the membership, is impressing itself even through the limitations of the existing constitutional machinery, and, if the present rate of progress is allowed freely and democratically to continue (especially taking into consideration the already large unrecorded minorities in many delegations), goes forward to a majority. At this moment to use the letter of mechanical rules in order to seek to strangle the life, to use official

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disciplinary measures in order to prevent the minority becoming a majority, would be a crime against the working-class movement. The leadership of the Labour Party, whatever its views, has the duty, not merely to apply mechanical rules passed in a different situation, but to take into account the living situation in the Labour Party. They have a responsibility not only to the past, but to the future. No artificial measures of obstruction can finally check the living movement of unity. But they can make its path more difficult, and they can delay its realisation when the need is urgent. There is still the possibility in this country (as the National March and the Hyde Park demonstration last year showed) for the advance to working-class unity to be realised harmoniously. Those who stand in the way of this will earn the odium of all working-class history. We would therefore seriously urge the present Labour Party Executive to think again, and yet again, before committing themselves to exert disciplinary measures against the supporters of the Unity Campaign in the Labour Party, and thus deliberately choosing, for the sake of a short-lived domination which can only end in the fate of German Social Democracy, to wreck the immediate future of the working-class movement.

FOR *it is not Unity that needs defending ; it is Division.* From the official Labour propaganda on the question of unity it might be imagined that the supporters of unity are the challenging rebels proposing a new and revolutionary innovation, and that the Labour Party Executive represent the old, traditional and fundamental principles of the Labour Party and the Labour Movement. In fact the exact contrary is the truth. The system of division, refusal of affiliation of socialist organisations, doctrinal disfranchisement and exclusions, is purely a post-war system invented and elaborated in the last dozen years, and had no place in the original foundation of the Labour Party or conception of its founders. The original conception of the Labour Party might have been vague and lacking in clearness of aim in many respects, corresponding to the stage of the movement ; but there was no question that it was the conception of a united coalition party of all socialist and trade union organisations willing to affiliate, without distinction.

THERE was no suggestion in the original foundation of the Labour Party that the old Social Democratic Federation (bearing no relation to the present caricature, but in fact historically developing stage by stage through the British Socialist Party into a component

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

element of the Communist Party) had any less rights as joint founder of the Labour Party with the Independent Labour Party and the Fabian Society, on the grounds that it claimed to preach Marxist doctrines of class war and social revolution. There was no suggestion that the old S.D.F. and I.L.P. could not be loyal to the Labour Party, because they were simultaneously affiliated to an " outside " international organisation, the old Socialist International (whose discipline at that time was regarded as fully binding on its component organisations), to which the Labour Party did not belong before 1908. During the war, when the B.S.P. and I.L.P. opposed the official Labour Party policy of support of imperialist war, there was no suggestion that therefore they might not remain affiliated to the Labour Party. Even as late as 1919 and 1920, when the British Socialist Party was affiliated to the Communist International, there was no suggestion that its affiliation to the Labour Party was thereby invalidated. These were the original principles of the Labour Party which the post-war leadership has departed from in a direction hostile to working-class interests and hostile to working-class unity.

THE system of division and doctrinal exclusion of militant socialists was first established as a system under the leadership of MacDonald at the Liverpool Conference in 1925. It is thus a post-war system, and it was in fact a response to a post-war situation. In 1925 there was a rising left wave of working-class militancy and unity, which swept the Trades Union Congress at Scarborough, and was leading forward to the General Strike. The demand was universally expressed by all the organs and leaders of capitalism that a rampart must be established in the Labour Party to hold back the new forces. To fulfil this rôle the Liverpool resolutions were carried amid the applause of the entire capitalist press. A similar process was taking place during this period in most of the social democratic parties and trade unions in the other Western and Central European countries.

IN essence the new process was the response of capitalism and capitalist influence in the Labour Movement to the revolutionisation of the workers in the post-war period. It was part of the mechanism of stabilisation. It was no accident that the most active agents in imposing the new system were MacDonald, Snowden, J. H. Thomas, Frank Hodges and Spencer—all later taken over openly into the capitalist camp. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subsequent careers of these men is eloquent for the significance of their system. MacDonald was in reality as much an agent of capitalism when he sought to strangle the working-class life of the Labour Party by the Liverpool decisions in 1925 as when he sought to disrupt the Labour Party still further by forming the National Government in 1931. From the Liverpool decisions of 1925 to the National Government of 1931 is a straight line. Unfortunately the seed implanted by MacDonald in the Labour Party for its destruction has been watered and fostered by his successors. They denounce the name of MacDonald, but they maintain his system.

TO-DAY it is possible to see in perspective the significance and outcome of this whole process. For this process has led to the victory of reaction, and, in the last resort, of fascism. Where it has been carried to the furthest extreme, as in the social democratic domination of the working-class movement in Germany, it has led to the wrecking of the movement and the victory of fascism. Where it has been checked in time and replaced by the alternative method of the united working-class front, as in France, the new line of unity has led to an immediate checking of the advance of reaction and replacement by working-class advance. In Britain it has led to the continued dominance of Baldwin and reaction almost without a break since 1925 ; for the nominal rule of MacDonald without Baldwin between 1929 and 1931 barely made any difference to the process of reaction. It has led to a situation in which the leadlong advance of the Labour Party in the first years after the war has been replaced by a complete stoppage of advance and long-drawn stagnation for over seven years which has had to be admitted by the leaders themselves. It has led to a situation in which the official organ of the Labour Party is compelled to declare :

> The fact had better be candidly faced that Labour's dynamic drive forward as a national force stopped in 1929. Since then it has on balance held its ground, but no more. (*Daily Herald*, November 7th, 1936).

Is any more comment needed on the practical fruits of the policy of disunity and exclusion of the militants, on whom the driving power for the advance of the Labour Movement necessarily depends ? These leaders have uncoupled the locomotive, and then complain that the train does not move.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN order the change this situation, in order to replace depression and defeat, by advance, and in order to meet the urgent issues, at home and abroad, of the present period, the first necessity is to end the present paralysing and disruptive policies and realise unity of all sections of the working class in the common struggle. This is the meaning and purpose of the Unity Campaign, conceived and led in deepest loyalty to the Labour Movement, its aims and needs. The Unity Campaign is no accidental, sectional manifestation, but the necessary outcome and response to the needs of the present stage. On every side a new awakening is spreading throughout the Labour Movement that it is time to score a line beneath the bad debt of the old period of disruption and defeatism, and that the realisation of unity in action of all sections is not merely the condition of new advance, but, as the example of country after country is showing, the price of survival. During the most recent period unity has been breaking through at a hundred points, despite all regulations to the contrary. Wherever unity in action has been even partially achieved (as in the fight against the unemployed regulations in 1935, the National March in 1936 or the defeating of Mosley in East London), immediate results have been gained, and the whole level of the movement has been raised. *But it is necessary now to generalise these partial advances into a general advance for the whole movement.* The necessary next step forward now is expressed in the aims of the Unity Campaign.

THE Unity Campaign offers the way forward for the entire Labour Movement from the present crisis, confusion and weakness to a new and higher level. It makes its appeal, not merely to the left, but to all serious socialists and trade unionists. The programme of unity put forward is directed to the immediate aims which will be recognised by all, to the fight against the fascist offensive, the fight for Spain, the fight for peace, the fight for the demands of the unemployed and employed workers, the fight to defeat the National Government and return a Labour Government based on the united movement. These aims hold no contradiction to the aims of the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress. What is at issue is to mobilise and organise and lead the united movement of the entire working class to realise these aims. It is not a question of one or two particular, small organisations. It is a question of the millions and millions of the working class, both within the organised Labour Movement and outside it, who are not yet being led

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the struggle. It is a question of the whole outcome of the struggle of fascism and democracy, of war or peace. It is a question of the future of the working-class movement.

THERE can be no standing still. The alternative to the line of the Unity Campaign means continued surrender to the National Government (as over Abyssinia, over Spain, over the Jubilee, over the constitutional crisis, over rearmament). It means support of rearmament by the National Government, surrender to conscription, paralysis and destruction of the Labour Movement, and the certainty of war. The urgency of the present issues needs no emphasis. It is essential, equally for the situation in Britain and for the world situation, to mobilise the majority of the population in Britain against the National Government and its policies. On the question of the People's Front in this country there is still controversy among socialists. These controversies will need to be cleared as rapidly as possible. But one thing is certain and agreed. The core of the People's Front must be the united working-class front. Herein lies the heart of the problem at the present moment in Britain, and the key to the obstacles to the People's Front. The Unity Campaign shows the way forward to the realisation of the united working-class front within the forms of the existing Labour Movement in this country. Towards this indispensable aim it calls for the support of all socialists and trade unionists, whatever their views. If all forces rally without delay to its support, resisting all attempts at disruption, it represents the greatest opportunity for advance in the history of the British Labour Movement. The hour of decision is here.

R. P. D.

● **BOUND VOLUMES**

".....have grown immensely in popularity."

Active workers in the Labour Movement find more than ever the great need for a handy and reliable reference to past events which is something more than a documentation of facts : that is why the Bound Volumes of the Labour Monthly have grown immensely in popularity.

We have a very favourable exchange system whereby on returning the loose copies for a year plus 4/6 in cash you get one of our Bound Volumes without any additional charge. (The full charge for the 1936 volume is 10/6.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITED FRONT

By STAFFORD CRIPPS

THERE is no doubt that a popular appeal can be made on the theme of unity, and the unthinking are not too particular as to what may be the basis for united political action. "Let us all pull together, boys," has long been one of the slogans of the National Government and for years now Mr. Lloyd George has, at intervals, told us that it is no time for party politics. The fascists raise the same cry, and we are constantly witnessing attempts in Parliament to "take out of politics" those inconvenient subjects, like unemployment, which bring to the workers a deeper realisation of the class struggle.

Poor Mr. Robert Boothby appearing on a people's front platform with Mr. G. D. H. Cole is horrified at the idea that the people's front should oppose our beneficent Government and so he stumps off the platform in high indignation leaving behind him only Mr. Cole and Mr. John Strachey! Yet Mr. Boothby is one of the more enlightened capitalists in the House of Commons and has several times been bold enough to take the National Government to task for their slackness in dealing with the problem of the herring fisheries, a problem which concerns his own electorate so closely.

This short-lived alliance which could not outlast a single public meeting is symptomatic of the dangers which beset a people's front, which is so broad based that it includes everything and nothing. These difficulties arise when it is a question of building up an opposition, but it is a grave mistake to consider the question of a people's front merely from the point of view of consolidating opposition to the National Government.

Even if we overlook, for the moment, the preparatory electoral difficulties, which Mr. Cole[1] seeks to overcome by suggesting a second ballot, the really insuperable objections become apparent when the formation of a people's front government is contemplated. Such a government must not only have a programme which will be supported in operation by all the elements of which it is composed, but that programme must be capable of dealing successfully with the economic and political problems with which it will of necessity find itself confronted.

From 1929 to 1931 we had in this country a Government with a basis of support which was, in effect, not at all unlike that of a people's front. The Liberals, unkindly nicknamed in that Parliament the Portuguese,

[1]See the January LABOUR MONTHLY for the article here referred to, itself continuing the Discussion started by Professor Laski in last November's issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were not participants in office, but they were very freely consulted upon important measures, and were an essential part of the Coalition that ruled the country.

The I.L.P., then the most extreme socialist party represented in Parliament, were supporters of the Government in which a number of their most eminent men held office. I think no one would suggest that there would have been a more successful outcome if some of the Liberal leaders, let us say Mr. Lloyd George, Sir Herbert Samuel and Sir John Simon, had been members of the Cabinet. The same futility would have been displayed, because, if the country was to be run upon capitalist lines, then the only way to do it was in the manner later adopted by the National Government. The most ruthless treatment of the workers was inevitable if capitalism was to survive and if the British Empire was to remain intact. All the progressive elements which joined in the National Government, National Labour, National Liberal, the Y.M.C.A. Group and other Young Tories, quite honestly took the view that economy and belt-tightening were essential measures for national salvation. It was because of these views that the Labour Party lost its then right-wing leaders, or the more important of them.

We were fortunate in that the disastrous failure of this progressive Government did not lead us straight into Fascism. All the elements were present including a financial scare, a discredited progressive party and a disillusioned people. As things turned out the majority of the National Government was so overwhelming that Parliament could be tolerated, since it was wholly obedient to the dictates of the Cabinet.

Are we going to do any better if we get a people's front government in the future, or are we going to discredit democracy and disillusion the people even more thoroughly than before, so that this time we shall get real fascism as a result ?

It seems to me that when we are seeking an alignment of forces for the political struggle it is essential that the alignment should correspond, at least roughly, with the real interests of the parties who are engaged in the struggle. The political Portuguese may be more of a danger than a help if they desert and go over to the other side, or if they force upon their allies, at a critical moment, actions as unwise as the setting up of the May Committee. Some degree of community of interest and stability of purpose is essential if a government is to be able to retain the confidence of the people.

However true it may be that the Labour Party, as at present constituted and led, is incapable of winning political power in the near future, I am convinced that it would be folly to dilute that party still further with reformist elements in order to gain electoral success. To win an election is not an end in itself. To turn out the Government is only a step towards

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obtaining one which is more effective for our purpose. Our aim is power, not in the void, but to do those things which we believe are essential to stabilise society nationally and internationally on foundations of economic justice. Experience shows that this cannot be done by reformist methods, and that the failure of reformism reacting upon a disappointed people creates the conditions favourable to fascism.

Mr. Cole seems to assume in his article in last month's LABOUR MONTHLY that a people's front embracing all progressive elements from the Liberal and Tory parties, the churches, social workers and other well-intentioned persons would have a determined leadership bent upon action effective to solve the crisis of capitalism. This is precisely what it never could have. We should immediately be met by repetitions of the declaration of Mr. Lloyd George in the Parliament of 1929-31, when he stated that his party would not support any measure of socialism. Bills would be cut about and emasculated in the Commons and more certainly in the House of Lords, which would still remain standing as the guardian of capitalist and imperialist interests.

Whatever history may prove to us in the next year or two as to the success or failure of a popular front government in France, I am certain that such a government in this country would find itself hopelessly unable to deal with the crisis in capitalism, which we all admit as a fact. That crisis cannot be solved by a programme of reform and concessions. It will inevitably deepen as a result of such treatment ; indeed it will be purposely deepened by the antagonists of the people's front who will still control the economic power in the country. The price paid by the workers for that failure would be as great, if not greater, than the price they will have to pay for the continuance in power of our present government.

The difficulty is that neither Mr. Cole nor any of us can have it both ways, as we should like to do. We cannot get a host of capitalists, who in the last resort will be intent upon the preservation of capitalism and imperialism, to help the workers to attain power, and, when we get to power, have a strong and determined government which will be prepared to risk and, if necessary, sacrifice the whole principle of private property in the solution of the evils which weigh so heavily upon the workers. If there is failure to solve these evils then all the Labour leaders who have participated in the people's front will be branded with that failure, and it will be left to some upstart demagogue like Hitler to make use of the people's disgust to attain fascism.

Mr. Cole tells us in his article that the most important point for agreement for the people's front is foreign policy. He will find a large measure of such agreement in the New Year's message sent out by the leader of the Labour Party, the Chairman of its National Executive and one of its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experts on foreign affairs—Mr. Noel-Baker in company with those well-known progressives Mr. Winston Churchill, Lord Lytton, the Duchess of Atholl, Mr. Lloyd George, Sir Archibald Sinclair, Mrs. Corbett Ashby, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Cecil and Sir Gilbert Murray. I wonder if that list of leaders satisfies him, particularly when he notices that Mr. Winston Churchill and not Major Attlee heads the list. I tremble to think of the government that would be formed by such a people's front, even in the unlikely event of their asking Harry Pollitt to join the Cabinet! It is sometimes helpful to descend from the general to the particular and to examine what these proposals mean in terms of the political personalities of the day. Here we have not hypothesis but actual fact, and it seems to me to be an ugly and unpleasant fact, boding no good for the British working class.

I do not myself accept the assumption which is implicit in Mr. Cole's argument that the working class of Great Britain is incapable of winning a political victory without the adventitious aid and leadership of unattached progressives. I believe that the real problem is to bestir the workers to political activity through a fuller realisation of the class struggle and all it means to them in their everyday lives. If all those who are without any doubt members of the working class were to vote Labour, the problem of an electoral majority would be solved. Some of these are undoubtedly influenced in their political thought and action by what the progressive intelligentsia say and do, but the great mass will only be moved by the elemental emotions of class loyalty and fellowship in the class struggle. In the light of world events to-day perhaps the most powerful appeal that can be made is the appeal for class solidarity and unity of the workers in the class struggle. It is because I believe in the power of this appeal that I am taking part in the campaign for a united front of the working class. The response to the Hunger March and to the fight of the Spanish workers has shown most clearly how strong the feeling is for unity.

The Labour Party is not to-day a much more satisfactory vehicle for working-class power than it was in 1931. The more insistent socialists are many of them unfortunately outside its membership, or will progressively find themselves turned out unless some change takes place. There is no prospect of the party placing itself at the head of a people's front; if it did so it would only be to accomplish a Lib.-Lab. coalition under a less discredited name. The leadership of such a people's front, if it were ever to come into existence, far from being stronger and more determined in its attitude to capitalism would be infinitely more compromising and hesitant than the Labour Party itself. The danger is that if the movement for a people's front grows it may be used as an excuse for the sort of fatal coalition grouping that is represented by the New Year's message dealt with above.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be said that there is no better chance of getting a united front than a people's front. I disagree. There is amongst the workers rural, as well as urban, a deep community of feeling arising out of sufferings shared for over a century, which creates a class loyalty that is far stronger than any fortuitous bond of political interest. That loyalty is being proved every day in strike movements, and was superbly demonstrated by the rank and file in 1926. The spontaneous demand for united fronts upon all kinds of working-class issues is a further proof, but for many of the workers this class loyalty has as yet no political content. If this loyalty can be harnessed behind a unity campaign which is energetically pursued there is no reason why it should not gather sufficient force amongst the rank and file to complete the conversion of the movement which started before the Edinburgh Conference. At worst an insistence upon unity can do no harm, and at best there will be brought back into the movement not a whole posse of wobblers and doubters, but a band of convinced socialists who will strengthen the backbone of the Party in dealing with capitalism when the chance comes.

The major problem with which we are faced is to get rid of the political apathy amongst the workers. In my view the appeal for a united front upon a class basis is more likely to accomplish that end, than is an appeal upon the basis of an all-inclusive progressive people's front.

Some may point to the risks entailed in the united front campaign, in that it may still further split the Labour Movement. The condition of the Movement is sufficiently grave at the present time to demand strong remedies, and for that purpose risks must be taken if necessary. In the long run—and not so very long—the unity campaign will, I believe, consolidate and not injure the Labour Party. The fate of individuals is supremely unimportant compared to the fate of the working class and its political organisation. I cannot myself envisage any other step than a successful drive for unity and its ultimate accomplishment of a united working-class party that will even put the British workers on the road to winning power.

Once this unity has been achieved and a strong and virile working-class party has been built up and has taken the political lead of the country, then it will be time enough to consider tactical associations with progressive groups, parties or individuals for electoral purposes. The essential matter is that the ultimate electoral front, whatever its name, should be controlled and dominated by a class-conscious workers' party, which will have the power and determination to challenge capitalism when that challenge becomes imperative, and which will not withdraw into the enemy's camp as Ramsay MacDonald and his friends did in the year 1931.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOWARDS UNITY

By W. J. R. SQUANCE

(*General Secretary, Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*)

TO-DAY one is amazed to learn from the Press and the speeches of prominent and highly placed political personages that this country has reached a position of stability and real prosperity. As concrete evidence of this healthy condition of affairs our attention is called to the great decrease in our unemployment figures ; to the restoration of wages cuts imposed in 1931, and 1932, the peak point of trade depression ; the upward tendency of improved conditions of employment and the note of renewed confidence expressed by the business world generally.

In view, however, of the silence maintained in regard to the fate of the one-and-a-half million unemployed, the suffering and anxiety of those who are subject to the " Means Test," the growing anxiety of the international situation, the suppression of liberty everywhere, except in one or two isolated instances, one is forced to the conclusion that the complacence of the capitalist class in accepting this condition of affairs as the best possible and one that should be endured without protest or action to remove these injustices, is humbug and evidence of their hypocrisy and determination to continue present-day exploitation at home and abroad, notwithstanding the ever-increasing danger of war abroad and serious disorder at home once the tolerance of the masses reaches breaking point. For I am convinced that a self-respecting community like ours will not for ever tolerate standards of life dictated by the exploitation of one section of the community by another, but will eventually demand the highest standard attainable by co-operative effort. Human intelligence will ultimately compel the conversion of industry from a struggle for private gain to a nationally planned economy, owned and carried on for the service of the community as a whole. Progress in any industry under these changed circumstances will not be measured in terms of interest, dividend, or improved values of investments, but will be translated into shorter hours, higher wages, and improved conditions of employment.

The many demands for the establishment of the 40-hour working week, the 6-hour working day, increased holidays with pay, which are being negotiated in important industries to-day and are also matters in legislation, are but preliminaries to the demand of the masses generally for the greater leisure of to-morrow and a social policy ensuring peace, plenty, and prosperity at home and abroad.

The problems of to-day are so grave on the home front and the differences on the international front so fundamental as to command the ingenuity and unity of all progressive forces for a march forward if justice

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to be won for all and real peace is to be established among all peoples. To cement forces along these lines may mean a violent departure from past policy, the giving up temporarily of some cherished principle, a venture into the unknown, the casting aside of beliefs held for many years, but the real issue and test now before us is whether such temporary departure can produce real and effective results for peace and democracy. I believe it will, and moreover, the urgency of the hour demands such procedure being applied. All right thinking people hate War and Fascism, because both mean the destruction of life, liberty, freedom and everything we value in life and hold dear.

These twin evils therefore must be fought by every possible means and at all costs so as to enable mankind to breathe freely and progress ever onward and upward towards Peace and Goodwill, for without peace there can be no real advancement, for during war destruction supersedes construction on all fronts.

The peoples of the world hunger for peace and unfettered democracy. They seek the opportunity to build up higher and nobler standards of life, to develop all peaceful pursuits, arts and all the good things that go to build up an ideal system of society. Without democracy, liberty and freedom of speech cannot exist, the right of organisation, the right of expression by means of the Press and public meeting, is suppressed by dictatorships whose first act is always to abolish these noble ideals.

In my many struggles on the industrial field I always kept my eyes glued on victory, and in my endeavours to secure such a result I marshalled all available forces for the struggle with the sole object of securing success and causing confusion to my opponents. If such policy is sound strategy on the industrial field it should be equally sound on the political field and will ensure success.

Our National Government, masquerading as a democratic institution, might be regarded as a huge joke, but for the huge toll of human suffering arising from present day unemployment, poverty, Means Test, and malnutrition of the masses. Eminent authorities remind us that in these days of supposed prosperity there are 20 millions of people who have not sufficient to eat to enable them to maintain normal standards of health; 13½ millions of people who are endeavouring to drag out an existence on a diet, which would be scorned if offered to cattle, and 4½ million families who spend on an average only 4s. per week on food. Yet at the same time tons of fish and fruit are cast into the sea and restrictions are operative on all sides. This unnatural condition of things does not arise because people's stomachs are full, nor because nature cannot provide sufficient, or for lack of scientific development, but for the simple reason that under our present system profit is king and poverty is the lot of the masses.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Remove the god of profit and you abolish exploitation, the only obstacle to the real co-operation of individuals and nations.

Co-operation will enable us to secure full and complete freedom and the right to reorganise society on lines that will give communities full access to the wealth they create and thus free men and women from the perils of poverty and want, and secure for them prosperity in terms of human happiness with opportunities for complete development, which up to now has been denied them under the existing system.

If we must have war then let it be a war on poverty and all the ugly features of society which to-day are belching forth unnecessary suffering and want amongst millions of our fellow citizens. Unemployment is really a phase of the greater problem of poverty and a wiser generation will insist that scientific development shall be the means for producing leisure and plenty for all, and unemployment as suffered to-day, with its hideous misery and want, will not be tolerated for a day. The momentous issues awaiting solution at home, the growing danger of war in Europe, the persistent onward march of Fascism, the tragedy of Spain, where democratic government has been denied the right to function by rebellious army forces, and thousands of people are bravely laying down their precious lives in the defence of democracy, the many nations who work increasingly for peace but whose efforts are thwarted by the dictates of fascist states, all call aloud for immediate action.

To delay taking effective action is highly dangerous for the maintenance of peace. Effective action can only be secured by the closest unity and a clear understanding between all progressive forces, whose minds should be concentrated on our economic problems at home, with a view to removing injustices and ushering in a new régime based on freedom and equality at home, and peace among the nations of the world. I am confident that once British democracy is fully alive to its responsibilities and powers it will convert the struggle for private gain to a planned national economy under which the country's economic forces will be publicly organised for the benefit of all, and thus banish the shame of poverty and social insecurity for all time from our midst.

In conclusion, may I add, that just as unity is essential for the correct solution of domestic problems, there is equally the same necessity for the peace nations to co-operate and unite for peace within the League of Nations, and as the leading power in the world it is incumbent upon Britain to accept the honour and privilege of playing the leading rôle in such a noble work—or shall I say duty—of giving the world a lead in the positive organisation of world peace.

A united front will render these things possible. Work for their achievement!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITY OR DISRUPTION

By HARRY L. SELF

(*Prospective Parliamentary Candidate, Eye Division of Suffolk*).

IN order to see the Labour Party's Conference at Edinburgh in proper perspective, it is necessary to consider certain important factors, not mentioned by Laski or Brailsford, which have a considerable bearing upon the present position of the Labour Party and can influence very largely its attitude in the present world crisis.

Only by so doing are we able to understand the full significance of the decisions arrived at as a result of the block vote. Many good Socialists have accepted the machinery of conciliation for the settlement of industrial disputes without realising that it bound the workers hand and foot to their capitalist oppressors. Wages Boards have done more to kill the fighting spirit of the working class than anything else imaginable. Moreover, the workers have been taught that they must accommodate themselves to the fluctuating fortunes or misfortunes of capitalism even at the expense of their own stomachs. Talk to any railwayman to-day about increased wages and he will immediately refer you to the traffic receipts of the four big railway companies ; if a slight increase is shown, his hopes begin to rise, but if a decrease he gives up all hope of securing any improvement in his conditions. The railwaymen have not yet been able to win back the cuts imposed in 1931 and are still thinking in terms of the industrial depression, just blindly waiting for a trade revival that does not come, apparently unaware that the index of industrial production is the highest ever recorded. What is true of railwaymen is equally true of the majority of trade unionists.

Wages and conditions of service depend mainly on the ability or inability of the industry to pay. In fact, the modern trade union leader in preparing his case for presentation to the Wages Board endeavours to prove by some means or other that the industry concerned can afford to meet his demands. In arriving at their finding it is not the business of the Wages Boards to attack the present economic system ; this was proved by the cold reception accorded the Sankey Commission's report. In most cases the appointed members can be relied upon to make recommendations strictly in keeping with the financial condition of the industry. Hence the urge for rationalisation supported by trade union leaders or the railwaymen's demand for fair competition between road and rail transport, as if there ever was such a thing as fair competition.

If the foregoing is correct is it any wonder that the movement is thinking in terms of social reform or a planned capitalism ? True, some of the trade unions have declared in favour of public ownership and control,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but these declarations are soon forgotten and cease to occupy an important place in trade union propaganda. Wages Boards may have served a useful purpose in the past, but they are an ineffective weapon during a period of chronic economic crisis such as capitalism is undergoing at the present time. So long as the trade union movement continues to think in terms of capitalist balance sheets, so long will it be stricken with paralysis. The dividing line at Edinburgh as elsewhere is between those who think and act in terms of concluding agreements with the big industrial capitalists and those who want to abolish capitalism and establish the new social order.

The revolt at Edinburgh, culminating in an unofficial conference of constituency party delegates, was in reality a revolt of Socialists against the trade union policy of class collaboration, which was initiated by the Mond-Turner Conferences and which still permeates the movement. The one redeeming feature of the present deplorable situation is the growing realisation among the workers that capitalism can make no further concessions by way of improving conditions except as the result of further rationalisation and the consequent displacement of their fellow workers. The left wing must seize every opportunity to drive home that lesson in the trade union branches with increasing vigour and determination ; then all talk of a split on political and industrial issues would soon disappear and working-class unity would become an obvious necessity. Meanwhile, it is important to remember that these were the circumstances in which the Labour Party met at Edinburgh to take decisions on questions of vital importance to the whole international labour movement—decisions which were forced upon it mainly as a result of the growing economic crisis.

The debate on Communist affiliation proved conclusively that right-wing leaders either do not, or will not, recognise the international class nature of the fascist offensive. To argue that Communism creates Fascism implies that a militant working-class policy precipitates the crisis and is apparently intended to justify the present tendency of subservience to the ruling class. If Sir William Beveridge's warning of a new depression in 1937 is correct, then there appears to be no limit to the sacrifices which the working class will be asked to make in the interests of capitalism and incidentally to prevent the coming of Fascism? Every one who has taken the trouble to study the rise of Fascism in Europe knows perfectly well that there was no Communist Party in Austria worth speaking of. Yet, in spite of that, Fascism conquered by using the same bloody methods against respectable right-wing leaders in Austria as the Nazis used against Communists in Germany. No one should be deceived by such petty childish arguments. The struggle for working-class unity must be continued with renewed energy and conviction.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Miners' Federation supported Communist affiliation as a result of unity forged in the day-to-day struggles of the miners. Similar tactics employed in all future industrial disputes can win sufficient support to reverse the Edinburgh decision. I believe the Communist Party's desire for unity is based on sincerity, resulting from experience in fascist countries. Of what interest would it be to any Communist to disrupt the Labour Party in face of the growing menace of Fascism? A concentration camp would probably be the reward for such action. Respectability carried to extreme limits will not prevent the coming of Fascism in Britain, if a new economic depression, more extreme than we have yet experienced, compels the ruling class to employ more ruthless methods to keep the workers in subjection. In such circumstances, working-class unity would be the decisive factor.

The resolution on armaments and the international situation was extremely vague and very confusing. It is doubtful whether it could be otherwise with any other resolution that attempted to placate the conflicting interests within the party. Whether or not it is meaningless, as some people have attempted to argue, remains to be seen. The National Council of Labour will no doubt interpret the resolution according to what it considers to be the requirements of the situation. One thing is certain beyond shadow of doubt. The right-wing leaders are quite clear on what they want. They want armaments to defend democracy against the menace of Fascism, with or without a Labour Government. Obviously they would prefer a Labour Government, but are prepared to take the risk of placing armaments in the hands of the present National Government in the hope that it can be persuaded or influenced to use those armaments to defend democracy. As Bevin put it in his speech, I want to drive this Government to defend democracy even against its will. But does the National Government require armaments for the same purpose as Mr. Bevin has in mind? If not, to what extent can it be driven against its will?

If the National Government wish to strengthen the peace forces in Europe it can do so by joining the Franco-Soviet Pact, but it refuses to do so. If it wanted to defend democracy it could restore to the Spanish Government its right by international law to buy armaments, but again it refuses to do so. The Hoare-Laval Memorandum proved its willingness to sacrifice Abyssinia to the fascist wolves and to betray every principle of Collective Security. The London-German Naval Agreement caused grave suspicion throughout the world regarding the National Government's real intentions. To expect a government with such a black record suddenly to become the guardian of democracy is carrying optimism to the point of recklessness. The National Government wants armaments for one purpose and one only: to defend its own imperial interests. For that reason it is prepared to sacrifice Russia on the altar

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Fascism, to allow Hitler and Mussolini to crush Spanish democracy and to let Collective Security become a dead letter. The only confidence the workers should have in regard to the National Government is confidence to bring about its defeat.

Strangely enough, the platform at the Edinburgh Labour Conference seemed to exercise considerably more caution and restraint on Spain than was the case on rearmament. It foresaw all the dangers of war inherent in the Spanish situation although all that it asked for was that the Spanish Government be given its right by international law to buy arms. The urge to drive the National Government to defend democracy was lacking. Here was a real opportunity to prove that democracy is not prepared to bend the knee to dictatorship all the time. The Spanish delegates convinced the Conference of the futility of the Non-Intervention Agreement and how that policy was playing into the hands of the Fascists. If the decision had rested with the Conference delegates it would have gone in favour of scrapping the policy of non-intervention, but the block vote decided otherwise. Spain is the cock-pit of the international class struggle, but class collaboration in the very nature of things is a denial of the class struggle.

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

By MARGERY CORBETT ASHBY

(*Late Liberal Candidate, 1935 General Election, for the Hemel Hempstead Division of Hertfordshire.*)

BECAUSE Peace and Democracy are alike at stake, the overwhelming preoccupation of all progressively minded people in this country must be how to get rid of the present Government. This Cabinet, like its predecessors, pushes on preparations for war because by a mixture of vacillation and deliberate bad faith they have missed every opportunity offered to strengthen the organisation of peace or to remedy urgent international grievances. It is easier to drive a frightened people into war " defence " expenditure (whose first profits rival those of the war profiteers) than to give an energetic lead towards the recovery of world trade, and the general prosperity that is the best defence against dictatorship or revolution.

We are all agreed that while Mosley may represent Fascism of a merely theatrical type, the real danger to liberty is the consistent limiting of individual freedom by our most cynical Prime Minister. The evidence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for this is found not only in the Incitement to Disaffection Act, and in the Political Uniforms Act, but in the prosecutions and imprisonment of political leaders *before* their speeches, police action in preventing meetings and demonstrations, police tolerance of Fascist disorder, the immense activity of the Government publicity department, and the removal of Vernon Bartlett from the B.B.C.

The Government learnt its lesson in publicity from the spontaneous outburst of indignation over the Hoare-Laval proposals—proposals which everyone now knows were so like those agreed to by the Cabinet as to make it unnecessary to inform the Prime Minister of them during the fatal week-end. Henceforth the Government carefully prepares the public mind for its successive failures in foreign policy and its growing demands on money and man power for war "defence."

Vast sections of the people would like to turn out the present Government—Liberals, Labour, Socialists, Communists, Pacifists, and probably, indeed, most of the one-third of the voters who do not go to the poll. But a Government cannot merely be turned out: it must be replaced. Who can take its place?

The Liberal Party is still small, though there is a definite revival—young recruits, new money, old members rejoining. The Liberal leaders have had experience of government, have been tested by hard times, and are of outstanding personal integrity and distinction.

The Labour Party is more numerous, and is strongly organised on the basis of the Trade Unions, but it has not increased since 1929, is timidly led, and easily scared into supporting the government. No Liberal can have anything but sympathy with the present cleavage in the party on the fundamentals of foreign policy—pacifism and isolation, or collective security. We have been through the mill ourselves, but whereas the Liberal Party has shed its timid right wing to the National Government, the Labour Party has the timid right wing in command, which is more soul-destroying. If neither party can eject the present government by its unaided strength, could they do it if they pulled—and pushed—together?

If the answer is Yes, the answerer is apt to confound the object of united effort with the method—joint programme and an electoral pact. The joint programme is possible, but unfortunately there is no question of an equal sacrifice from both sides. All the apparent sacrifice would have to be made by the Labour Party. I believe such an apparent sacrifice might be made by the younger members, but never by the present officials. They have built up the Labour Party with unspeakable devotion and unwearying toil from tiny beginnings, the outcome of the social achievements of Radicals and Liberals. They have built it on accepting no deviation from the full theory of the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution and control. It was this rigidity plus

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. MacDonald's vanity which prevented their accepting Asquith's generous offer of co-operation with the first Labour Government. Had that offer been accepted I believe we could have changed the face of the world. Can the younger generation retain its honest belief in theoretic socialism and its conviction that " capitalism " cannot be mended but must be ended, and yet perceive that at this crisis of a drift towards war and Fascism it is concentration on an immediate and emergency short term programme which is essential ?

Danger produces queer bed-fellows. It is the urgency of the danger which can consolidate our first line defence. If Socialists study the Liberal programme in foreign and social policy they will find nothing to prevent the realisation ultimately of their own programme, unless it may be that the Liberal programme, faithfully carried out, would bring such peace and plenty as would satisfy ordinary needs, and thus remove the urge towards Socialism. Most of the surviving democracies in Europe have socialist governments, but socialist governments which make but small efforts to implement the extreme socialist theory. In practice, they are liberal and radical rather than socialist ; but they are in fact efficient bulwarks of peace and democracy.

The Labour Party is failing to get recruits because, while blaming capitalism for all our troubles, it refuses to accept any remedy but the abolition of private ownership, although there is urgent and desperate need for concentrated action against war profiteering, which is again shamelessly rampant, and producing once more the inequality of income which was automatically beginning to disappear. Safeguards against abuse are falling one by one as the nation is driven towards conscription. A short term Liberal policy adopted by the Labour Party to cover the period before, during, and immediately after the next election, would not compromise their ultimate goal. The Liberals would be steadily building up their organisation, gathering their recruits from those who would never be socialist, and as a party standing for no class, and repudiating all class warfare.

Given a willingness to compromise on a practical programme, there are points on which the two parties could agree, points that would gather together adherents of the Liberal Party, the Labour Party, many members of the L.N.U., the Council of Action, the Five Year Group, the New Commonwealth, and the many new Popular Front groups. Such might be :

(1) *Reduction of trade barriers.* The Conservative policy of economic imperialism is a counterpart of the economic nationalism of the dictatorships, and prevents the revival both of trade and of friendly international relations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2) *To press for adequate means for the examination and redress of international grievances.* Willingness to examine questions of colonies and raw materials is an essential contribution to world peace.

(3) *Collective Security.* To make this a reality through strong support of the League of Nations. The Labour Party must, however, decide for which policy the party stands—pacific isolation or co-operation to achieve collective security. A joint programme with the Liberals depends on their adopting the latter.

(4) *Reduction and limitation of armaments* by international agreement, with the immediate support for the constructive proposals for national and international control of the Royal Commission on the Traffic in Arms. No one can expect the present government to go further than these unanimous recommendations, and if the Government is compelled to adopt them they will greatly facilitate the work of the next progressive government.

In home affairs that policy that any Labour Government could in fact carry out would be almost identical with the Liberal Party's declared policy in the industrial Yellow Book, and agricultural Green Book. The immediate policy could be agreed on in education, child welfare, pensions, compensation, insurance. Indeed, Liberals could accept the seven points of Mr. Cole's programme,* though there might be differences of opinion over the pace and scope of No. 5, for which the solution would be mutual consultation and compromise.

As regards practical co-operation, both national headquarters should encourage friendly relations in constituencies where they already exist. Where neither party has a candidate already, a conference of progressive people—not merely party officials—might result in an agreed candidate for the agreed programme.

I have heard it said that this alliance would be as disgraceful as that of the National Liberals and National Socialists with the Conservatives, but surely that is a superficial view ? When men like Sir Herbert Samuel and Lord Lothian joined the National Government it was for a united front on a short term programme. The bargain was not honestly kept, and the Conservatives almost immediately not only modified but completely reversed the agreed programme. A progressive Popular Front would not be a Baldwin stunt to win an election, but to carry out an immediate emergency programme which would leave both parties with independent ultimate goals. Single member constituencies make co-operation far more difficult than under the French system of list voting, but the institution of the Second Ballot could only be obtained as a result of united effort at the polls.

*As stated in his article in the January issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROBLEM OF THE DISTRESSED AREAS

(*Concluded.*)

By WAL HANNINGTON

Training and Transference

NOW let us consider briefly one or two points about the question of training centres and industrial transference. I have already mentioned the danger of transference and it now seems that the Commissioner and the Government are pressing these schemes more and more to the front. A fact which we have to consider in connection with the provision of some kind of industrial training for the young unemployed workers is that most parents prefer that their children should be provided with some kind of industrial training rather than they should hang around on the streets with nothing to do. But the plain fact is that the training which they are being given is not of the right sort. Much of their time is taken up in physical jerks instead of being seriously taught a trade. Further, we must recognise that even the training of a person for a trade cannot be treated as a question by itself—there must go with it provision for employment after the trade has been learned. Mr. Malcolm Stewart in his Second Report had to admit the following :

> Under the schemes now in operation insufficient employment is found for those who have been trained. The majority drift back home after training and feel that the effort made has been wasted.

The National Administrative Council (N.A.C.) of the National Unemployed Workers Movement has had to consider this question of juvenile training and transference, and has condemned the present policy of the Government in this respect on the grounds that juvenile unemployed workers are not getting the proper trade training and that both juveniles and adults who are being transferred to other areas are being used to undermine trade union standards and conditions. The N.A.C. have laid down the following demands in relation to this question :

(*a*) That where juveniles are sent to training centres they must be given, not physical drill, but proper training which will fit them for a trade.

(*b*) That provision must be made by the Ministry of Labour for trade union supervision of all training schemes for juveniles.

(*c*) That representative working-class supervisory committees should be established in regard to all schemes of industrial transference.

(*d*) That in all cases where workers are asked to transfer to other districts for work, proper safeguards and guarantees must be given to ensure that trade union wages and conditions will be observed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We must endeavour to get the official trade union movement to take up these demands and to insist upon their application by the Government.

From the Depressed Areas of England and Wales during the twelve months from December, 1934, to November, 1935, inclusive, 21,620 persons were transferred from these areas to other parts of the country under schemes either directly administered by the Ministry of Labour or effected by voluntary bodies with the aid of grants from the Ministry or from funds at the disposal of the Commissioner. This total included 9,494 men, 4,314 women, 3,739 boys and 4,073 girls. For the following year, 1936, we find that in a period of eight months there were transferred from the Special Areas of England and Wales, 21,713 persons, whilst in addition there were 8,238 men who were known to have left the Distressed Areas and found work for themselves, making a total of 29,951. We see from these figures how the question of transference is being intensified instead of the Government providing work for the unemployed in their own towns.

Land Settlement

Then there is the question of land settlement, which is advocated by the Commissioners. I do not believe that any hope can be held out for the Distressed Areas from this proposition. First, we must remember that there is already considerable unemployment amongst agricultural workers in Britain, and I know of no evidence which would justify us believing that the settlement of miners on the land would enable them to earn a livelihood by producing agricultural products, when we know that in relation to the present consuming power of the workers there is already an abundance of such products and not a shortage.

There is in fact much evidence to show that in the case of ex-service men who have been settled on the land, many of them have been driven out of their small holdings and those who have still managed to hold on are undergoing serious difficulties. They have to face the increasing competition of larger farms that are operating on a system of rationalisation and making use of mechanical inventions which the smallholders cannot obtain. Since the Ottawa Conference in 1932, there has been a concerted restriction of production in agricultural produce. This was followed by the decision of the World Economic Conference of 1933, definitely to restrict the production of wheat on the basis that there was a glut in this commodity.

In the face of such things, what is the use of talking about settling thousands of unemployed workers on small holdings? They would simply be reduced to still further penury, distress and failure.

Important authorities who have written on this question, such as Messrs. C. S. Orwin and W. F. Dark, after a thorough survey of the position,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have concluded that "*the transfer of large numbers of industrial workers to agriculture would still further depress the agricultural workers' standard of living, and contract the market for the produce of existing growers.*" Viscount Astor and Mr. Seebohm Rowntree, who are also considered authorities on this question, at one time strongly urged land settlement. They later went into the question in greater detail and produced a report based upon their enquiry entitled the "Agricultural Dilemma." They flatly declare as follows:

> The system of small holdings offers no support to the idea that it is capable of any large extension at the present time, still less that it can be used on any considerable scale as a means of absorbing the industrial unemployed . . . . smallholders have even a harder life and lower standard of living than family farmers with larger acreage, and the decline in their number in recent years indicates that their staying power is on the whole somewhat less . . . . the outlook for many of them is far from promising.

I think the idea of solving the problem of the Distressed Areas by encouraging land settlement in the present conditions is not only a hopeless proposition, but is a cruel deception practised upon the unemployed.

A Programme for the Distressed Areas

I have made my criticisms about the problem of the Distressed Areas and the inadequacy of the present schemes and recommendations. My remarks have, of course, been only brief in this respect, because there is no space for dealing with the problem in detail in this article. I now come to the question of what is to be done to meet the problem. First let me repeat that I consider that the immediate step which the whole working-class movement should compel the Government to take is that of providing immediate relief by way of food, clothing and household utensils for the victims of the Distressed Areas. At the same time we must force the Government to face up to the whole question in a manner that they have not yet attempted. We must oppose the idea that the Distressed Areas are to remain derelict areas and that nothing can be done to revive them. These areas have been, before the war, prosperous industrial areas; they can be made so again. If a Workers' Socialist State was established in Britain we would know how to utilise the available man power of these areas and the mineral and industrial resources which are still available in them. But until such a system of organisation of our economic life is realised, we must demand that all obstacles which are to-day placed in the way of the workers being provided with socially necessary work schemes shall be broken through.

We cannot tolerate vested and monopoly interests standing in the way of the provision of employment, such as is shown in the example of the River Severn bridge scheme. There is very much work that could be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

immediately undertaken by the Government, had they the will to do it. There is still big scope for the building of new main trunk roads, circular roads round cities and minor district roads ; there is the improvement of canals and waterways which in many cases are obsolete for modern traffic, and many of them need to be rebuilt. It is estimated that there are 4,000 bridges in England and Wales that are most defective or inadequate for modern transport. There are thousands of level crossings which are a danger to life and which are unsuited for modern transport, over which bridges could be built or underground tunnels constructed.

There is still the urgent need for a great national housing scheme to remove the slums and properly house the population of this country. The extension of electricity to all workers' dwellings in town and rural areas would provide much employment for skilled and unskilled workers. There is the whole question also of land drainage. We know only too well how in recent years we have read from time to time of floods which have occurred because of the bad state of river walls and inadequate land drainage. In regard to schools : many of the school buildings are obsolete and unhealthy. In 1933 it was estimated that there were no fewer than 2,146 schools in England and Wales which were on the black list as condemned and incapable of improvement. Many of them are still being used. Everybody knows that there is a grave shortage in respect to medical facilities, particularly in regard to hospitals. One often hears of workers having to wait weeks with some serious illness before they can be admitted to hospital, because there are no beds available. Hospitals have to resort to begging on the streets in order that they can build new wings to meet the urgent need which exists to-day for medical attention. There is, of course, also the whole question of the sanitary conditions in working-class districts. There are still millions of workers who live under mediæval conditions in regard to water supply. Even in many of our big cities, as well as in mining and agricultural villages, the sanitary conditions of many workers' houses are appalling.

Why cannot these problems be tackled by the Government ? Surely such work is socially necessary work and should be done. If we wish to go still deeper into the question of providing employment, there is the question of the raising of the school-leaving age, with Government grants to families, so that the considerable army of juvenile labour would be removed from the labour market ; the question of adequate pensions for all workers at sixty so that they could retire from their labour with security, and their places in industry be taken by younger men who are to-day unemployed. There is also the demand for the 40-hour working week without wage reductions, which can not only be advanced on the grounds of absorbing workers in industry, but is a justifiable demand on the grounds that the workers under modern production conditions have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been speeded up and produce per man on a greater scale than ever before, and are therefore entitled to shorter hours of toil.

These particular demands have already been endorsed by Labour Party Conferences and Trades Union Congresses, but we have yet to see the the T.U.C. attempt a real campaign for the realisation of these objectives. I see no reason why we should not raise the demand that the £224,000,000 interest which is annually paid to the bond-holders of the National Debt should be used to finance a national plan of work schemes such as I have mentioned above. It certainly could not be argued that by diverting the money from the pockets of the interest-reapers into meeting the cost of effective work schemes, that this would not be a sound economic proposition and mean sound utilisation of such capital. Much of the useless expenditure on Royalty could also be stopped and utilised for providing decent men and women with a chance of earning their own livelihood.

United Action for the Unemployed

If we are to compel the National Government to face up to this problem on the lines suggested above, we must recognise that the whole of the working-class movement must go into this struggle with a greater spirit and determination than has hitherto been displayed. We welcome the fact that the Labour Party has appointed its own commissioners to investigate the problem of the Distressed Areas, but unless their investigations are followed up by intense agitation, we shall have got no further. It is not more information that we want about the Distressed Areas—we have plenty of that already—it is concrete propositions from the working-class movement on how to tackle the Distressed Areas and how to compel the Government to act, that is needed.

The unemployed themselves must become a driving force for such a campaign within the Labour movement. We must stimulate consistent agitation on the part of the unemployed against tolerance of their poverty conditions. We must strengthen the organisation amongst the unemployed and bring them into closer relationship with the organised employed workers, in such a way as to ensure that the whole working-class is made to realise the gravity of the Distressed Areas problem and unemployment generally.

This problem of the Distressed Areas is a life and death question for millions of our class. It must be faced. I believe that the Hunger Marchers have already aroused such a feeling on the question that if we can now mobilise the whole working-class movement for united action against the Government on this issue, the Government can be forced out of office if it refuses to break with its present policy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

By JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

(*In the May issue of last year the* LABOUR MONTHLY *published a full text of the most important sections of the Presidential address of Jawaharlal Nehru to the Lucknow Session of the Indian National Congress. In view of the situation to-day in India and of the great importance of the developments connected with the present elections under the new Constitution, now following immediately after the fiftieth Session of the Indian National Congress held at Faizpur in December last, the* LABOUR MONTHLY *is here publishing in full some of the most important sections of Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru's Presidential address delivered on December 26th, 1936, at this Session.*)

BEFORE we consider the problems that face us, we must give thought to our comrades—those who have left us during these past few months and those who languish year after year, often with no end in prospect, in prison and detention camp. . . . To our comrades in prison or in detention we send greeting. Their travail continues and it grows, and only recently we have heard with horror of the suicide of three detenues who found life intolerable for them in the fair province of Bengal whose young men and women in such large numbers live in internment without end. We have an analogy elsewhere, in Nazi Germany, where concentration camps flourish and suicides are not uncommon. . . .

We are all engrossed in India at present in the provincial elections that will take place soon. The Congress has put up over a thousand candidates and this business of election ties us up in many ways, and yet I would ask you as I did at Lucknow to take heed of the terrible and fascinating drama of the world. Our destinies are linked up with it, and our fate, like the fate of every country, will depend on the outcome of the conflicts of rival forces and ideas that are taking place everywhere. Again I would remind you that our problem of national freedom is but

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a part of this great world problem, and to understand ourselves we must understand others also. . . .

How has fascism grown so rapidly, so that now it threatens to dominate Europe and the world? To understand this, one must seek a clue in British foreign policy. This policy, in spite of its outward variations and frequent hesitations, has been one of consistent support of Nazi Germany. The Anglo-German Naval Treaty threw France into the arms of Italy and led to the rape of Abyssinia. Behind all the talk of sanctions against Italy later on, there was the refusal by the British Government to impose any effective sanction. Even when the United States of America offered to co-operate in imposing the oil sanction, Britain refused, and was content to see the bombing of Ethiopians and the breaking up of the League of Nations system of collective security. True, the British Government always talked in terms of the League and in defence of collective security, but its actions belied its words and were meant to leave the field open to fascist aggression. Nazi Germany took step after step to humiliate the League and upset the European order, and ever the British "National" Government followed meekly in its trail and gave it its whispered blessing. . . .

In the world to-day these two great forces strive for mastery—those who labour for democratic and social freedom and those who wish to crush this freedom under imperialism and fascism. In this struggle Britain, though certainly not the mass of the British people, inevitably joins the ranks of reaction. And the struggle to-day is fiercest and clearest in Spain, and on the outcome of that depends war or peace in the world in the near future, fascist domination or the scorching of fascism and imperialism. That struggle has many lessons for us, and perhaps the most important of these is the failure of the democratic process in resolving basic conflicts and introducing vital changes to bring social and economic conditions in line with world conditions. That failure is not caused by those who desire or work for these changes. They accept the democratic method, but when this method threatens to affect great vested interests and privileged classes, these classes refuse to accept the democratic process and rebel against it. For them democracy means their own domination and the protection of their special interests. When it fails to do this, they have no further use for it and try to break it up. And in their attempt to break it, they do not scruple to use any and every method, to ally themselves with foreign and anti-national forces. Calling themselves nationalists and patriots, they employ mercenary armies of foreigners to kill their own kith and kin and enslave their own people. . . .

During the past eight months I have wandered a great deal in this vast land of ours and I have seen again the throbbing agony of India's masses, the call of their eyes for relief from the terrible burdens they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carry. That is our problem ; all others are secondary and merely lead up to it. To solve that problem we shall have to end the imperialistic control and exploitation of India. But what is this imperialism of to-day? It is not merely the physical possession of one country by another ; its roots lie deeper. Modern imperialism is an outgrowth of capitalism and cannot be separated from it.

It is because of this that we cannot understand our problems without understanding the implications of imperialism and socialism. The disease is deep-seated and requires a radical and revolutionary remedy and that remedy is the socialistic structure of society. We do not fight for socialism in India to-day, for we have to go far before we can act in terms of socialism, but socialism comes in here and now to help us understand our problem and point out the path to its solution, and to tell us the real content of the Swaraj to come. With no proper understanding of the problem, our actions are likely to be erratic and purposeless and ineffective.

The Congress stands to-day for full democracy in India and fights for a democratic State, not for socialism. It is anti-imperialist and strives for great changes in our political and economic structure. I hope that the logic of events will lead it to socialism for that seems to me the only remedy for India's ills. But the urgent and vital problem for us to-day is political independence and the establishment of a democratic State. And because of this, the Congress must line up with all the progressive forces of the world and must stand for world peace. . . . For us, and we think for the world, the problem of peace cannot be separated from imperialism, and in order to remove the root cause of war, imperialism must go. We believe in the sanctity of treaties but we cannot consider ourselves bound by treaties in the making of which the people of India had no part, unless we accept them in due course. The problem of maintaining peace cannot be isolated by us, in our present condition, from war resistance. The Congress has already declared that we can be no parties to an imperialist war, and we will not allow the exploitation of India's man power and resources for such a war. Any such attempt will be resisted by us.

The League of Nations has fallen very low and there are few who take it seriously as an instrument for the preservation of peace. India has no enthusiasm for it whatever and the Indian membership of the League is a farce, for the selection of delegates is made by the British Government. We must work for a real League of Nations, democratically constructed, which would in effect be a League of Peoples. If even the present League, ineffective and powerless as it is, can be used in favour of peace we shall welcome it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With this international background in view, let us consider our national problems. The Government of India Act of 1935, the new Constitution, stares at us offensively, this new charter of bondage which has been imposed upon us despite our utter rejection of it, and we are preparing to fight elections under it. Why we have entered into this election contest and how we propose to follow it up has been fully stated in the Election Manifesto of the All-India Congress Committee, and I commend this manifesto for your adoption. We go to the legislatures not to co-operate with the apparatus of British imperialism, but to combat the Act and seek to end it, and to resist in every way British imperialism in its attempt to strengthen its hold on India and its exploitation of the Indian people. That is the basic policy of the Congress and no Congressman, no candidate for election, must forget this. Whatever we do must be within the four corners of this policy. We are not going to the legislatures to pursue the path of constitutionalism or a barren reformism.

There is a certain tendency to compromise over these elections, to seek a majority at any cost. This is a dangerous drift and must be stopped. The elections must be used to rally the masses to the Congress standard, to carry the message of the Congress to the millions of voters and non-voters alike, to press forward the mass struggle. The biggest majority in a legislature will be of little use to us if we have not got this mass movement behind us, and a majority built on compromises with reactionary groups or individuals will defeat the very purpose of the Congress.

With the effort to fight the Act, and as a corollary to it, we have to stress our positive demand for a Constituent Assembly elected under adult suffrage. That is the very corner-stone of Congress policy to-day and our election campaign must be based on it. This Assembly must not be conceived as something emanating from the British Government or as a compromise with British imperialism. If it is to have any reality, it must have the will of the people behind it and the organised strength of the masses to support it, and the power to draw up the constitution of a free India. We have to create that mass support for it through these elections and later through our other activities.

The Working Committee has recommended to this Congress that a convention of all Congress members of all the legislatures, and such other persons as the Committee might wish to add to them, should meet soon after the election to put forward the demand for the Constituent Assembly, and determine how to oppose, by all feasible methods, the introduction of the Federal structure of the Act. Such a Convention, which must include the members of the All-India Congress Committee, should help us greatly in focussing our struggle and giving it proper direction in the legislatures and outside. It will prevent the Congress members of the legislatures from developing provincialism and getting entangled in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minor provincial matters. It will give them the right perspective and a sense of all India discipline, and it should help greatly in developing mass activities on a large scale. The idea is full of big possibility and I trust that the Congress will approve of it.

Next to this demand for the Constituent Assembly, our most important task will be to oppose the Federal structure of the Act. Utterly bad as the Act is, there is nothing so bad in it as this Federation and so we must exert ourselves to the utmost to break this, and thus end the Act as a whole. To live not only under British imperialist exploitation but also under Indian feudal control, is something that we are not going to tolerate whatever the consequences. It is an interesting and instructive result of the long period of British rule in India that when, as we are told, it is trying to fade off, it should gather to itself all the reactionary and obscurantist groups in India, and endeavour to hand partial control to the feudal elements.

The development of this federal scheme is worthy of consideration. We are not against the conception of a federation. It is likely that a free India may be a federal India, though in any event there must be a great deal of unitary control. But the present federation that is being thrust upon us is a federation in bondage and under the control, politically and socially, of the most backward elements in the country. . . .

Backward Russia, with one mighty jump, has established a Soviet Socialist State and an economic order which has resulted in tremendous progress in all directions. The world has gone on changing and hovers on the brink of yet another vast change. But not so the Indian States ; they remain static in this ever-changing panorama, staring at us with the eyes of the early nineteenth century. The old treaties are sacrosanct, treaties made not with the people or their representatives but with their autocratic rulers.

This is a state of affairs which no nation, no people can tolerate. We cannot recognise these old settlements of more than a hundred years ago as permanent and unchanging. The Indian States will have to fit into the scheme of a free India and their peoples must have, as the Congress has declared, the same personal, civil and democratic liberties as those of the rest of India. . . .

Having preserved themselves as autocratic units, which are wholly outside the control of the rest of India, the rulers of these States have gained power over other parts of India. To-day we find them talking as if they were independent and laying down conditions for their adherence to the Federation. There is talk even of the abolition of the viceregal paramountcy, so that these States may remain alone in the whole world, naked and unchecked autocracies, which cannot be tampered with by any constitutional means. A sinister development

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the building up of the armies of some of the bigger States on an efficient basis. . . .

Our policy is to put an end to the Constitution Act. We are told by people who can think only in terms of action taken in the legislatures, that it is not possible to wreck it, and there are ample provisions and safeguards to enable the Government to carry on despite a hostile majority. We are well aware of these safeguards ; they are one of the principal reasons why we reject the Act. We know also that there are second chambers to obstruct us. We can create constitutional crises inside the legislatures, we can have deadlocks, we can obstruct the imperialist machine, but always there is a way out. The Constitution cannot be wrecked by action inside the legislatures only. For that, mass action outside is necessary, and that is why we must always remember that the essence of our freedom struggle lies in mass organisation and mass action.

The policy of the Congress in regard to the legislatures is perfectly clear ; only in one matter it still remains undecided—the question of acceptance or not, of office. Probably the decision of this question will be postponed till after the elections. At Lucknow I ventured to tell you that, in my opinion, acceptance of office was a negation of our policy of rejection of the Act ; it was further a reversal of the policy we had adopted in 1920 and followed since then. Since Lucknow, the Congress has further clarified its position in the Election Manifesto and declared that we are not going to the legislatures to co-operate in any way with the Act but to combat it. That limits the field of our decision in regard to offices, and those who incline to acceptance of them must demonstrate that this is the way to non-co-operate with the Act, and to end it.

It seems to me that the only logical consequence of the Congress policy, as defined in our resolutions and in the Election Manifesto, is to have nothing to do with office and ministry. Any deviation from this would mean a reversal of that policy. It would inevitably mean a kind of partnership with British imperialism in the exploitation of the Indian people, an acquiescence, even though under protest and subject to reservations, in the basic ideas underlying the Act, an association to some extent with British imperialism in the hateful task of the repression of our advanced elements. Office accepted on any other basis is hardly possible, and if it is possible, it will lead almost immediately to deadlock and conflict. That deadlock and impasse does not frighten us ; we welcome it. But then we must think in terms of deadlocks and not in terms of carrying on with the office.

There seems to be a fear that if we do not accept office, others will do so, and they will put obstacles in the way of our freedom movement. But if we are in a majority, we can prevent others from misbehaving ;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we can even prevent the formation of any ministry. If our majority is a doubtful one, then office for us depends on compromises with non-Congress elements, a policy full of danger for our cause, and one which would inevitably lead to our acting in direct opposition to the Congress mandate of rejection of the Act. Whether we are in a majority or in a minority, the real thing will always be the organised mass backing behind us. A majority without that backing can do little in the legislatures, even a militant minority with conscious and organised mass support can make the functioning of the Act very difficult.

We have put the Constituent Assembly in the forefront of our programme, as well as the fight against the federal structure. With what force can we press these two vital points and build up a mass agitation around them if we wobble over the question of office and get entangled in its web ? . . . .

We have seen the gradual transformation of the Congress from a small upper class body, to one representing the great body of the lower middle classes, and later the masses of this country. As this drift to the masses continued the political rôle of the organisation changed and is changing, for this political rôle is largely determined by the economic roots of the organisation.

We are already and inevitably committed to this mass basis, for without it there is no power or strength in us. We have now to bring that into line with the organisation, so as to give our primary members greater powers of initiative and control, and opportunities for day-to-day activities. We have, in other words, to democratise the Congress still further.

Another aspect of this problem that has been debated during the past year has been the desirability of affiliating other organisations, of peasants, workers and others, which also aim at the freedom of the Indian people, and thus to make the Congress the widest possible joint front of all the anti-imperialist forces in the country. As it is, the Congress has an extensive direct membership among these groups ; probably 75 per cent. of its members come from the peasantry. But, it is argued, that functional representation will give far greater reality to the peasants and workers in the Congress. This proposal has been resisted because of a fear that the Congress might be swamped by new elements, sometimes even politically backward elements. As a matter of fact, although this question is an important one for us, any decision of it will make little difference at present ; its chief significance will be as a gesture of goodwill. For there are few well organised workers' or peasants' unions in the country which are likely to profit by Congress affiliation. There is not the least possibility of any swamping, and, in any event, this can easily be avoided. I think that now or later some kind of functional representation in the Congress is inevitable and desirable. It is easy for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Congress to lay down conditions for such affiliation, so as to prevent bogus and mushroom growths or undesirable organisations from profiting by it. A limit might also be placed on the number of representatives that such affiliated organisations can send. Some such recommendation, I believe, has been made by the United Provinces Provincial Congress Committee.

The real object before us is to build up a powerful joint front of all the anti-imperialist forces in the country. The Congress has indeed been in the past and is to-day, such a united popular front, and inevitably the Congress must be the basis and pivot of united action. The active participation of the organised workers and peasants in such a front would add to its strength and must be welcomed. Co-operation between them and the Congress organisation has been growing and has been a marked feature of the past year. This tendency must be encouraged. The most urgent and vital need of India to-day is this united national front of all forces and elements that are ranged against imperialism. Within the Congress itself most of these forces are represented, and in spite of their diversity and difference in outlook, they have co-operated and worked together for the common good. That is a healthy sign both of the vitality of our great movement and the unity that binds it together. The basis of it is anti-imperialism and independence. Its immediate demand is for a Constituent Assembly leading to a democratic State where political power has been transferred to the mass of the people. An inevitable consequence of this is the withdrawal of the alien army of occupation.

These are the objectives before us, but we cannot ignore the present-day realities and the day-to-day problems of our people. These ever-present realities are the poverty and unemployment of our millions, appalling poverty and an unemployment which has even the middle classes in its grip and grows like a creeping paralysis. The world is full of painful contrasts to-day, but surely nowhere else are these contrasts so astounding as in India. Imperial Delhi stands, visible symbol of British power, with all its pomp and circumstance and vulgar ostentation and wasteful extravagance ; and within a few miles of it are the mud huts of India's starving peasantry, out of whose meagre earnings these great palaces have been built, huge salaries and allowances paid. The ruler of a State flaunts his palaces and his luxury before his wretched and miserable subjects, and talks of his treaties and his inherent right to autocracy. And the new Act and Constitution have come to us to preserve and perpetuate these contrasts, to make India safe for autocracy and imperialist exploitation.

As I write, a great railway strike is in progress. For long the world of railway workers has been in ferment because of retrenchment and reduction in wages and against them is the whole power of the State. Some

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time ago there was a heroic strike in the Ambernath Match Factory near Bombay, owned by a great foreign trust. But behind that trust and supporting it, we saw the apparatus of Government functioning in the most extraordinary way. The workers in our country have yet to gain elementary rights ; they have yet to have an eight-hour day and unemployment insurance and a guaranteed living wage.

But a vaster and more pressing problem is that of the peasantry, for India is essentially a land of the peasants. In recognition of this fact, and to bring the Congress nearer to the peasant masses, we are meeting here to-day at the village of Faizpur and not, as of old, in some great city. The Lucknow Congress laid stress on this land problem and called on the Provincial Committees to frame agrarian programmes. This work is still incomplete for the vastness and intricacy of it has demanded full investigation. But the urgency of the problem calls for immediate solution. Demands for radical reforms in the rent and revenue and the abolition of feudal levies have been made from most of the provinces. The crushing burden of debt on the agricultural classes has led to a widespread cry for a moratorium and a substantial liquidation of debt. In the Punjab *Karza* (Debt) Committees have grown up to protect the peasantry. All these and many other demands are insistently made and vast gatherings of peasants testify to their inability to carry their present burdens. Yet it is highly doubtful if this problem can be solved piecemeal and without changing completely the land system. That land system cannot endure and an obvious step is to remove the intermediaries between the cultivator and the State. Co-operative or collective farming must follow.

The reform of the land system is tied up with the development of industry, both large-scale and cottage, in order to give work to our scores of millions of unemployed and raise the pitiful standards of our people. That again is connected with so many other things—education, housing, roads and transport, sanitation, medical relief, social services, etc. Industry cannot expand properly because of the economic and financial policy of the Government which, in the name of Imperial Preference, encourages British manufacturers in India and works for the profit of Big Finance in the City of London. The currency ratio continues in spite of persistent Indian protests ; gold has been pouring out of India continuously now for five years at a prodigious rate, though all India vehemently opposes this outflow. And the new Act tells us that we may do nothing which the Viceroy or the Governor might consider as an unfair discrimination against British trade or commercial interests. The old order may yield place to the new but British interests are safe and secure. . . . .

Only a great planned system for the whole land and dealing with all these various national activities, co-ordinating them, making each serve the larger whole and the interests of the mass of our people, only such

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a planned system with vision and courage to back it, can find a solution. But planned systems do not flourish under the shadow of monopolies and vested interests and imperialist exploitation. They require the air and soil of political and social freedom.

These are distant goals for us to-day, though the rapid march of events may bring us face to face with them sooner than we imagine. The immediate goal—independence—is nearer and more definite, and that is why perhaps we escape, to a large extent, that tragic disillusion and hopelessness which affects so many in Europe.

We are apparently weak, not really so. We grow in strength, the Empire of Britain fades away. Because we are politically and economically crushed, our civil liberties taken away, hundreds of our organisations made illegal, thousands of our young men and women always kept in prison or in detention camp, our movements continually watched by hordes of secret servicemen and informers, our spoken word taken down, lest it offend the law of sedition, because of all this and more we are not weaker but stronger, for all this intense repression is the measure of our growing national strength. War and revolution dominate the world and nations arm desperately. If war comes or other great crisis, India's attitude will make a difference. We hold the keys of success in our hands if we but turn them rightly. And it is the increasing realisation of this that has swept away the defeatist mentality of our people.

Meanwhile, the general election claims our attention and absorbs our energy. Here, too, we find official interference, in spite of denial, and significant attempts to prevent secrecy of voting in the case of illiterate voters. The United Provinces have been singled out for this purpose and the system of coloured boxes, which will be used everywhere else, has been ruled out for the U.P. But we shall win in these elections in spite of all the odds—State pressure, vested interest, money.

That will be but a little step in a long journey, and we shall march on, with danger and distress as companions. We have long had these for our fellow travellers and we have grown used to them. And when we have learned how to dominate them, we shall also know how to dominate success.

OUR LATEST PAMPHLET

WHO IS PROSPEROUS IN PALESTINE ?

By BRITISH RESIDENT

6d. each

from The Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, W.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SELECTED LETTERS

By V. I. LENIN

[*This is a continuation of the series, which was commenced in last month's issue, of a selection of Lenin's letters. They have been chosen from Volume XXIX. of the 3rd Russian Edition* (1934) *of the Collected Works. They consist of various letters written in the period* 1911-1922. *Practically all of them have been published before in various papers in the Soviet Union since the Revolution, but it will be seen that in almost every case they have been printed in this Volume from the original manuscript or from the copy found in the Tsarist Police Archives. The letters in this instalment continue dealing with questions of the press and the Duma elections and Lenin's attitude to them. They have been specially translated and annotated for the* LABOUR MONTHLY.]

No. 39.

To the Editorial Board of *Pravda* in Petersburg
(Between 26 and 29 November, 1912. Cracow).

Dear Colleague,

We are extremely sorry to notice two omissions in Sunday's *Pravda :* first, there is no article on the Basel Congress[1] ; and secondly, the message of greeting from Badayev and others to the Congress is not printed. As to the first, we are also to blame, because we did not send an article. We were completely occupied with very important matters. To have written such an article would not have been at all difficult, and the editorial board knew that the Congress opens on Sunday. The second omission is entirely Badayev's fault. It is quite unpardonable that he takes no trouble about his paper, and that he gives his signature to things without bringing them immediately to the paper. A workers' paper in Petersburg without the collaboration of the workers' deputy of Petersburg (who is in addition a supporter of *Pravda*) is quite ridiculous. It is absolutely necessary that as much attention as possible should be given to this important omission both by the editorial board and by Baturin (to whom incidentally I ask you to hand over this letter and from whom it would be very pleasant to have a few lines), and by the deputy.

You asked for Gorky's address. Here it is : Signor Massimo Gorki, Villa Spinola, Capri, Naples (Napoli), Italy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here is the address of a correspondent in Rome. Write to him ; he will write for *Pravda.* B. Antonov (B. Antonoff), via le Giulio Cere 47, Roma (Rome), Italy.

Why don't you send the money due ? The delay is causing us great difficulties. Don't be late, please. Why haven't you responded to the request to print in the paper an advertisement that the editorial board is looking for Nos. 5-10 of *Pravda ?*

All the best !

Yours, V.

First printed in 1924 in *Krasnaya Letopis,* No. 1 (10).

Printed from a copy preserved in the files of the Department of Police, entry No. 4570 of 16 November, 1912.*

No. 40.

To I. V. Stalin in Petersburg.
For Vasiliev[2].
(6 December, 1912. Cracow).

Dear Friend,

Re January 9th, it is extremely important to think out and prepare everything in advance. A leaflet must be got ready in advance, calling for meetings, a one-day strike and demonstrations (this must be decided on the spot, where you can judge better). The mistake of November 15 must be corrected—against the opportunists, of course. There must be three revolutionary slogans in the leaflet (republic, eight hour working day, and confiscation of the landowners' lands), with special emphasis on the 300 year " shame " of the Romanov dynasty. If there isn't complete and absolute assurance of the possibility of having the leaflet in Petersburg, it will have to be prepared here well in advance and brought to you. The insolence of the liquidators in the question of Yagello[3] is unexampled. If we have all our six from the workers' electoral colleges, it is impossible silently to submit to some Siberian or other[3]. If the six are outnumbered, they must come out with a very strong protest, print it in *Dni* and announce that they appeal to the rank and file, to the workers' organisations. The liquidators want to boost their majority and to bring about a split with the Polish social democrats. Can the representatives of the six workers' constituencies really submit to Skobelev and Co. ? Or to some chance Siberian ? Write more often and more fully, in greater detail. The articles in *Luch* against the strikes are the height of meanness. You must act strongly, illegally. Write quickly to tell me which of your projected plans for such a campaign you choose. Greetings.

*The discrepancy between the date of the letter and that under which it was entered in the police files is due to the fact that Lenin, writing from abroad, used the Western calendar, which was 13 days in advance of the calendar used in Tsarist Russia.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Return the document—it is awkward to use it as a *carte d'identité*. The owner may be in Petersburg.

First published in 1924 in the book, *The "Zvyezda" and "Pravda" Period*, 1911-14, Part III.

Printed from a copy written in the hand of N. K. Krupskaya.

No. 41.

To M. A. Saveliev[4] in Petersburg.
(December 11, 1912. Cracow).

Dear Friend,

The weekly[5] has been left with some articles which might be suitable for you just now. You must hunt them out at all costs. Among them are Frey's articles "From the Practice of English Liberal politicians" and his "Two Utopias" (Kadets and Narodniks); Skopin's "Marx and Freiligrath," and some others. Please look these out quickly, read them, and let us know your opinion. I am awaiting your letter with impatience: has the money been received, and what is the latest date for sending manuscripts? Greetings. . . . .

I enclose the questionnaire for the six deputies elected from the electoral college. This must be handed over to them and their answers to all the questions got quickly. Some of them have already promised to do this. . . . . None of them will refuse if the importance of it is explained. Only don't let them raise it "officially" in the fraction. That would only give rise to delay and fuss. Let them do it themselves, and quickly. It would be best if they do not confine themselves to formal answers to the questions, but, following the general lines of the questionnaire, give a connected account each of his own province. Appoint somebody to assist. Invite the collaboration of all. What's the news of the paper now? Why don't your advertisements appear now?[6] Did you write to Venietz?

Questionnaire.

On the elections to the Electoral College.

(1) How many plenipotentiaries were there?

(2) How far did the workers participate in the elections of the plenipotentiaries? If possible, state approximately the average number or percentage of workers who turned up at the elections. Was a deliberate boycott organised? If so, where exactly, and by whom? In your opinion, what were the causes of the poor attendance of workers at the elections?

(3) Were there pre-election meetings before the elections of plenipotentiaries? Where exactly? How and by whom were the meetings conducted?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4) Were election manifestos distributed in factories and workshops? State exactly in which ones. How did the workers react to these manifestos? Were there instructions to the plenipotentiaries? What were they exactly?

(5) How were the candidates for plenipotentiaries nominated? Were there dual social-democratic candidates? Were there candidates of other parties (monarchists, non-party)?

(6) Were there preliminary meetings of plenipotentiaries before the elections of electors? Legal or illegal? What discussions took place at these meetings?

(7) How were the lists of electors drawn up? Were there proposals from social democratic groups and organisations? Were there one or two lists?

(8) Describe the main discussions at the meetings of plenipotentiaries prior to the elections of electors; the speeches of the Right and non-party people; the clashes between social-democrats of different tendencies, etc.

(9) Was the deputy to the Duma nominated in the meeting of plenipotentiaries itself?

(10) Was an instruction given to the electors?

(11) Which of the following elements predominated among the plenipotentiaries: young people, old people, party people, politically ignorant? Was working-class literature read? What exactly? What was their attitude to workers' papers? How was the distribution of the workers' papers carried out among them? Were there members of the trade union movement, etc., among them? How many Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, liquidators, non-fraction people?

(12) Were there any disputes and clashes among the electors?

(13) Were there attempts of the Right at the Provincial meetings to push through as deputy a man the workers did not want?

(14) Were there worker electors at the preliminary conferences with oppositional electors? What was discussed at these conferences? How did the following behave: workers, Kadets, Progressives, peasants?

(15) Mention all cases known to you of pressure from the administration and the police on the workers' elections: arrests, explanations, leaving names out of the lists, short notice of the dates of elections, etc.

(16) Did any organisational inter-connection remain between delegates and electors?

(17) Were instructions given to the deputy and if so, what exactly?

(18) What are you (the deputy): bolshevik, liquidator, non-fraction?

(19) Add any further information you think necessary.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would be, best of all, if you give the material not as formal answers to the questions, but, taking the questions supplied as a general guide, simply write in your own way all that you saw in the elections. It is extremely important to collect the material. Of course, we shall only print what you consider possible. After revising it, we will show it to you before printing. Don't bury the questionnaire.

Don't raise this matter in an "official" way in the fraction. This will only give rise to delays and fuss. Get it done yourself, first among the six deputies of the workers' electoral college.

First published in 1924 in the book, *The Zviezda and Pravda Period*, 1911-14, Part III.

Published from a copy preserved in the files of the Department of Police, Entry No. 4748 of November 30, 1912.

No. 42.

To the Editorial Board of *Pravda* in Petersburg.
(February 21, 1913. Cracow).

Esteemed Colleagues,

Permit me first of all to congratulate you on an enormous improvement in all conduct of the paper which is evident in the last days: to congratulate you and to wish for further successes in this direction. The day before yesterday I sent the first two short articles on "The Growing Contrast." From No. 234 of *Pravda* I see clearly that these articles won't do. Therefore please give them without delay to *Prosveshchenie*, to which I shall send the last part. Please give to the same paper the other unpublished articles (answer to Maevsky; concerning morality; Bulgakov on the peasantry—Bulgakov's articles in *Russkaya Mysl*—and so on). Please let me know quickly whether this has been done. Send Nos. 7, 8-21 and 24 of *Luch*, and No. 25 of *Pravda*. I always used to receive *Pravda* in the morning, as I still do *Rech* and *Novoe Vremya*. But during the past week *Pravda* has been coming late, and I only get it in the evening. It is clear that the mailing department is functioning badly. I urgently ask you to take steps to ensure more regular daily despatches.

I have not been receiving any new books. You must take steps (*a*) to get them from the publishers by making a payment in advance; (*b*) to get through the deputies the Duma and official publications. It is absolutely impossible to work without books . . . . I have neither *Zavety* nor *Russkaya Molva*. It is impossible to do without them. I particularly need that number of *Russkaya Molva* which wrote about *Luch* and explained that the Mensheviks are against illegal work.

March 14, 1914, will be the thirtieth anniversary of the death of Marx. You ought to bring out a four-page supplement the size of *Pravda* for two or three kopeks, with a large portrait of Marx and a number of short

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

articles. With advertisements (in detail of both *Pravda* and *Prosveshchenie*). It would probably pay for itself in an edition of 25-30,000 and bring in a profit. If you agree, wire me the one word " Prepare " (we will then set about writing), but also write a more detailed reply. Please answer two or three times a week with a few lines to say which articles you have received and which are suitable.

In my opinion, you have done perfectly right in publishing *Dnevnitsky* in full—as a beginning. But in future it will be better to hold back such long (and such bad) articles and enter into correspondence about handing them over to *Prosveshchenie*.

Yours, I.

First published in 1924 in the book, *The Zviezda and Pravda Period*, 1911-14, Part III.

Printed from a copy preserved in the files of the Department of Police, entry No. 442 of February 11, 1913.

No. 43.

To M. A. Saveliev in Petersburg.
(February 22, 1913. Cracow.)

Dear Colleague,

It is a great pity that our correspondence still does not work properly —that there is not a special address for you personally—that you do not answer questions for such ages. (1) I have already written to you a very, very long time back to say that, besides the article on " English disputes concerning Liberal labour policy," there are at *Zviezda* also the following articles : " Two Utopias " and a critique of boycottism (against Amfiteatrov : I don't remember the title). I repeat the request to look them out and send them to me. I hope to make use of them. (2) At *Pravda* there is also a number of articles which have not been used by them. I earnestly beg you to get hold of them and to make out of them notes of a journalist, signed, for example, T . . . . Approximate contents : (1) Answer to Maevsky (in *Luch* on the liquidators)—(this subject is now the more necessary since Dnevnitsky and Plekhanov have been singing to such a foul tune in No. 234 of *Pravda*). (2) Bulgakov in *Russkaya Mysl* on the peasantry (I don't remember the title). (3) Concerning morality (two little articles). (4) " The growing contrast " (on the occasion of the February, 1913, conference of the Kadets ; we must comment on that. Two short articles were sent the day before yesterday to *Pravda*, the remaining four I am sending to-day). The paragraph headings must be set up not in large type (as has been done in No. 1 of *Prosvieshchenie* in the article on " the results of the elections "), but in small.

There is a terrible number of misprints in the first number of *Prosvieshchenie*. . . . . I am sending the corrected proofs of the article on " English disputes concerning liberal labour policy." See that it comes out. Is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it possible that you still haven't got rid of Mikhalchi. . . . . That is necessary, really necessary. I see on p. 26 of the first number of *Prosveshchenie* a misprint which must be corrected in print. I enclose the correction.

VI. II.

ERRATA.

In the January number of *Prosveshchenie* (1913, No. 1) there were many misprints. We are correcting one of these which distorts the sense. On p. 26, line 23 from the top, for "25 per cent. in the Labour Party," read "52 per cent."

First published in 1924 in the book, *The Zvezda and Pravda Period*, 1911-14, Part III.

Printed from a copy preserved in the files of the Department of Police, Entry No. 440 of February 11, 1913.

No. 44.

To V. M. Kasparov in Berlin.

(Not earlier than June 14, 1913. Poronin).

Dear Comrade,

I received and read your article. In my opinion, the subject is approached very well and worked out correctly—but it has not enough literary polish. There is far too much—how should I say—"agitation" in it, and this is unsuitable in an article on a *theoretical* question. In my opinion, either you yourself ought to change it, or we shall try to do so.

Many thanks for the news about Kostrov.[7] Please ask Abel to write and give us information more often. This is important, for we don't know *anything*.

Can you get and translate the Georgian articles by Kostrov, (*a*) against the liquidators ; (*b*) on the national question, *for* cultural national autonomy ; (*c*) *the most important*—against Plekhanov's preface to Arkomed, against Plekhanov's defence of hegemony.

I am going for some weeks to Berne. On my return, I hope we will more than once have a chat by letter.

I shake your hand,

Yours, LENIN.

P.S.—Thanks for the copy of *Pravda*.

First published in 1930 in *The Lenin Symposium*, XIII.

Published from the manuscript.

No. 45.

To N. I. Podvoisky in Petersburg.

(June 17, 1913. Zakopane).

Dear Friends,

In our opinion, you made a mistake in getting mixed up with Fedor.[8] Probably nothing but squabbles will come out of it. You should have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issued your own report.[9] But now it is necessary to proceed from what has already been done. In the given circumstances it is imperative first of all to insist *upon full equality*, and, to begin with, to move a formal resolution, roughly as follows: "The co-operative[10] resolves that in the drawing-up of reports, there will not be allowed any dominance of one tendency over another, and both tendencies (the Six and the Seven) enjoy full equality in all respects, i.e., the commission is composed of equal parts, controversial points are worked out by agreement and not on majority principles. If at the end of a report deputies' speeches are reprinted, then the choice of the speeches shall also be made by agreement." This resolution is imperative. Otherwise they will compose the commission of equal parts, but afterwards the co-operative will, by the majority of one vote, confirm what the liquidator has suggested. If Fedora[8] rejects this resolution, we recommend an official declaration that, in view of there being no desire to allow equality, you reserve for yourselves full freedom of action. In doing so, you can nevertheless put up your own candidate. . . . .

We enclose a most elementary outline of the theses:

(1) Electoral campaign. Its circumstances. Results for the social-democrats, social-democratic platform, 8-hour day, confiscation of land, full democracy.

(2) Composition of the social-democratic fraction. Formation. The Yagello affair. (Statement of the point of view of the Six and the Seven. Reference to protests.)

(3) Political platform of the fraction and its first acts. Declaration. Indication that the Six reject cultural national autonomy. Indication that the broad masses of the workers approved the very slogans of the declaration. Characterisation of the political position of the social-democrats.

The main slogans still remain: the 8-hour day, transference of the land, full democracy.

(4) Questions put by the fraction.

(5) The fraction and the budget.

(6) The bourgeois fractions in the Duma and the severe criticisms of them and the Liberals (speeches of Maklakov, the Octobrists, the Black Hundred).

(7) The workers and the fraction. Instructions, appeals, reactions, material for questions (in the Duma) mutual financial assistance, etc.

(8) Inviolability of the deputies (Petrovsky incident).[11]

Internal discords; each side itself expounds its own point of view, an equal number of pages being given to each. Statements of both sides

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the press are to be reprinted. List of workers' resolutions, their number. Appendix. Most important tasks.

We are waiting for news. The country houses are hired.[12]

First published in 1924 in *Red Chronicles*, No. 1 (10).

Printed from a copy preserved in the files of the Department of Police, Entry No. 1656 of June 21, 1913.

1. The Basle Congress of the Second International.

2. Vasiliev. Pseudonym for Stalin.

3. Yagello-Siberian issue. Shortly after the opening of the Duma a deputy from Irkutsk, named Mankov, arrived, and attached himself to the liquidator group of the social-democratic fraction, so ensuring its majority. Not satisfied with this accession from Siberia, the liquidators brought into the fraction a deputy named Yagello, elected from Warsaw by the support of the Polish Socialist Party, the Bund, and others against the Social Democratic candidate. The Bolshevik deputies protested strongly against a non-member of the Social-Democratic Party being elected a member of the fraction.

4. Saveliev: An old Bolshevik, joined the Russian revolutionary movement at end of 1890's. In 1912 was editor of *Prosvieshchenie*, and member of *Pravda* editorial board. Since 1917 has held various responsible literary, journalistic and academic positions, including editorship of *Izviestia* and *Pravda*, and membership of Communist Academy and Academy of Sciences.

5. *Zviezda.*

6. *Prosvieshchenie's* advertisements in *Pravda.*

7. Pseudonym of N. Giordania, the Georgian Menshevik.

8. Fedor and Fedora. Nicknames for the Menshevik Fraction in the 4th Duma.

9. The proposal was to issue a joint report on the work of the Bolshevik and Menshevik Deputies.

10. Co-operative. The united meeting of Bolshevik (6) and Menshevik (7) deputies.

11. G. Sverdlov and his wife had been arrested in the rooms of Petrovsky, a Bolshevik deputy to the Duma.

12. For accommodating members of a proposed party school.

Have you ensured that your organisation will be represented at the Conference on February 14th?

(See inside front cover for full particulars, visitors also welcome, admission 6d.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

MUTINY IN HISTORY.

Mutiny from Spartacus to Invergordon. T. H. Wintringham. (Stanley Nott.) 355 pp. 7s. 6d.

IN this book T. H. Wintringham has set his hand to a task which is very big, and has entered a field of history—the history of mutinies—which has been practically untouched by bourgeois historians. For a ruling class a mutiny among its armed forces is an extremely dangerous event which places in jeopardy the very means on which, in the last analysis, depends its power to coerce the ruled class. The members of a ruling class always reflect on a mutiny with a shudder of horror, even though the crisis should have been apparently safely overcome. For this reason it is but natural that bourgeois historians should jump over such events and ignore them completely, or, should they mention them at all, dismiss them in a few curt lines which conceal rather than reveal the true character of such events.

The author has limited his study to mutinies in the strictest sense of that word, he deals with uprisings amongst men who are serving under arms and who revolt against their superior officers, against the authority to which they have sworn obedience. Starting with the revolt of the Roman slaves led by Spartacus, and rapidly surveying the mutinies in the army of Cromwell, and the British fleet at the Nore, Wintringham goes on to give a detailed analysis of events within living memory, touching on the Indian Mutiny on the way. It is the modern events from 1905 onwards that receive the biggest share of attention in the book and it is these events which are handled best by the author.

The mutinies in the army of Cromwell are presented with an over-simplification of the historical background in which they occurred that is liable to be a little misleading. One can hardly agree when the author says (p. 48) " only the personal strength of one man, Cromwell . . . . stood between the angry men of the army and their aims." Without denying the fact that the personality of individuals does play a rôle in history, we must not ascribe to individuals the tremendous power to change history which a statement such as the above would imply. The Ware revolt was conditioned to a large extent by the Putney conference which had taken place seventeen days previously, and this conference cannot be ignored in any estimation of the mutiny at Ware. On page 353 the author flies to the other extreme when he says " one execution of a mutineer aroused against him (Cromwell) the Levellers' War." There is no doubt that the execution of Robert Lockyer was a focal point in the mutiny, but one cannot say that this event aroused the mutiny, the mutiny started at Ware and only hung fire during 1648 because of the outbreak of the second civil war, compelling a united front of the Levellers and the Presbyterians.

In his handling of the events of 1917 in the French armies, and the mutiny in the German navy in the same year, the author shows the big repercussions of the February revolution in Russia, and the growing war-weariness of the armed forces which reflected the increasing misery of the civilian population. He gives a fully documented description of these mutinies, and reveals information which has been shrouded in secrecy for many years. Particularly striking is the analysis of the mentality of the " brass-hats " who were responsible for the senseless slaughter of thousands of troops, by throwing them into battles

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which were simply mass suicides. So widespread were these mutinies which took place in the French army that at one time no less than sixteen of seventeen army corps were involved, yet the only deaths occurred when a few officers tried to subdue the men with revolvers and were killed for their pains.

The author shows very clearly the spontaneous character of the mutinies and the fact that the mass of soldiers and sailors involved in them were not actuated by revolutionary motives, but mutinied because of very real material grievances. For those who think that to-day, at any rate, " England is different " the author gives detailed factual material dealing with the various demobilisation revolts of 1918, and also deals in detail with the Invergordon events of 1931.

One point stands out clearly in his analysis: revolts are not " made " by people interested in fomenting them, they grow out of the class contradictions within the armed forces themselves. Another point which stands out sharply is :—mutinies do not pass over into revolution unless they are led by a party that knows precisely what is demanded by the moment. In this connection Comrade Lenin, in summing up the results of the Moscow uprising of December, 1905, pointed out that it is wrong to imagine that troops even when wavering, go over to the revolution of their own accord, but he also emphasises that the troops must have already begun to waver before they can be won over to the side of the revolution. He says: " As a matter of fact, the wavering of the troops which is inevitable in every really popular movement, leads to a real *fight for the troops* (Lenin's italics) whenever the revolutionary struggle becomes more acute " (page 349, Vol. 3, Selected works). The analysis of Wintringham underlines every word of this statement of Lenin.

The history of the Russian revolution, and the civil war and intervention, is inextricably connected with mutinies, and the revolt of the French Black Sea fleet occupies a prominent part in this respect. It was this mutiny, if we except the actual Russian mutinies themselves, which showed the nearest approach to a conscious revolutionary leadership, and in this connection the name of André Marty occupies an honourable position. The author has done the working class movement a great service in making available the facts of this revolt to English speaking readers.

Wintringham correctly takes as his starting point of investigation " that mutiny is a class phenomenon " (p. 350), and shows that so long as the armed forces are based on an antagonistic class basis, mutinies are inevitable. He also shows why the only armed forces in the world which are not based on antagonistic classes, the armed forces of the U.S.S.R., can be free in the future from mutiny. The book is a good book and worth the attention of every serious student of the working-class movement. It is a book which should be placed in all public libraries.

T. C.

A FAULTY STUDY OF DE VALERA.

Unique Dictator. By Desmond Ryan. (Arthur Barker Ltd.) pp 311. 10s. 6d.

IT is no criticism of Desmond Ryan's readability to say that *Unique Dictator* reminded me of that penny pudding which David Copperfield bought in the Strand: " it was a stout, pale pudding, heavy and flabby, and with great flat raisins in it, stuck in whole at wide distances apart." The raisins, in this case, are Mr. Ryan's direct contributions to the book, for there are few

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who have the beating of him at colourful writing ; but there are too many suety slabs from his subject's speeches.

In the twelve months ahead, Eamonn de Valera will be much in the world's eye, and Mr. Ryan's book is well-timed. But though the author calls it a " study " rather than a biography, he falls into his own trap. " They have picked de Valera to pieces, and found everything but an answer to the question," he says of the critics. Mr. Ryan must face the same charge. He tells us of de Valera's birth at New York, his father a Spanish artist and his mother from County Limerick ; his rearing among the Bruree hills, and his appointment as Professor of Mathematics at Rockwell College ; his considerable part in the 1916 Rising (an exciting, brilliant chapter, this—the real Desmond Ryan) ; his imprisonment and rise to national leadership as President of the Irish Republic's Executive Council ; his wordy duels with Lloyd George and his rejection of the Treaty ; the defeat of the Civil War and his rise as leader of a new political party, Fianna Fáil ; then his election triumphs and the renewal of Anglo-Irish differences on the plane of constitutional-diplomatic manœuvring. Mr. Ryan throws his spotlight on the many facets of his subject's personality. But we knew that Mr. de Valera is a man of some intellectual ability, courageous, pedantic, austere, imperious, and what is called " sincere " in his attitudes, contradictory though they have been. And when we know all this we still have " everything but an answer to the question."

The question, of course, is : What has been Mr. de Valera's rôle in Ireland's national resurgence, and what has determined his attitude at successive stages of the struggle ? What, for instance, explains de Valera's evolution from a twentieth-century Rory of the Hills, a guerrilla chief in arms against the Free State, to head of that same Free State's Government ten years later ? What explains his evolution from the de Valera who in 1921 discussed with the Soviet representatives in America what would now be called a treaty of friendship and non-aggression (the draft treaty has been published ; Mr. Ryan is silent on this episode) to the de Valera who in 1934 slandered the Soviet Union at Geneva?

English propagandists and Cosgraveite opponents like to portray Mr. de Valera as an intransigent. The truth is, the man has always been a waverer. He wavered publicly before the I.R.A. forced Lloyd George to discuss terms. His offence between the Truce and the opening of the Civil War was not that he made sanguinary speeches or ruthlessly put aside peace efforts, but that he did nothing but make speeches and befog the nation's mind, while Collins, Griffith and the others who accepted the Treaty were organising their forces to crush resistance.

Ireland's bourgeois revolution (i.e., that stage of it which became the Anglo-Irish War of 1918-21) was carried through by the Irish people in opposition to the big bourgeoisie. But it was this big bourgeoisie which came to power in the first Free State Government. It was these interests that found new spokesmen and champions in Griffith and Collins. De Valera represented the dissatisfied petit-bourgeois elements, unwilling to accept the Treaty, unwilling to resist it, incapable of rallying the masses, incapable of conducting a military struggle. Desmond Ryan's brief description of the Civil War rout of the Republicans smacks too much of the Yeatsian " weasels fighting in a hole " ; he sees nothing of the class leadership which inevitably drove the Republican rearguard to final defeat on the hillsides of Kerry. Nor is Mr. Ryan able to explain de Valera's decision to enter the Dáil in 1927, and to see in it a war-weary small bourgeoisie turning their backs on revolution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Ryan is a Treatyite and an admirer of Cosgrave, but it is a sentence eulogising Cosgrave that inadvertently explains de Valera's general election victory in 1932:

> In all but two things, the record of the Cosgrave Government was so creditable and its achievements so evident that its long continuance in office was not surprising: the Ulster Boundary and its conservative social and economic programme. (p 218).

In other words, save that it had almost restored the Free State to the British Empire, save that it had looted the mass of the people to maintain the "prosperity" of a thin crust of exploiters, the Cosgrave Government was excellent! Once de Valera entered the parliamentary path, it was inevitable that the swelling anti-imperialist feeling and social discontent should find a vent in Fianna Fáil.

Mr. Ryan might have added a "third thing": that the Cosgrave régime had made a mockery of constitutional rights and democracy. The Cosgraveites had little trouble in transforming themselves into blue-shirted Fascists after their election defeat, and it is only in keeping with their governmental record that they are to-day organising a mass campaign to subvert democracy and impose a Fascist dictatorship on the Free State.

Which brings me to the final point. De Valera is head of a bourgeois government, vacillating on the national issue, reactionary on social issues. But Fianna Fáil—despite its suppression of popular forces—still adheres to democratic forms, and the title of this book is a dangerous misnomer. Mr. de Valera is not a dictator, even a "unique dictator," in the only serious sense of the term—a Fascist dictator. The Fascist menace in Ireland comes from the Cosgrave Opposition, its creation and creature the "Irish Christian" Front, and from O'Duffy. But de Valera and his Government are not fighting this menace; their police are turned on Republicans.

BRIAN O'NEILL.

ZIONISM AND ITS FRIENDS.

Thy Neighbour. By Lord Melchett. (Frederick Muller Ltd.) 7s. 6d.

"ANTI-SEMITISM," wrote Engels in 1890, "is nothing but the reaction of the mediæval, decadent strata of society against modern society which essentially consists of wage-earners and capitalists." Engels was referring to the German and Russian junkers, the instigators of, and principal assassins in, the pogroms of that time. Since then, the capitalists, as decadent as the junkers, and with a cultural level beneath that of the Dark Ages, resort to anti-semitism as a means of impeding the progress of civilisation, which has no further use for their economic and political system.

The violence that anti-semitism has now assumed, the horrors of the Nazi persecution of the Jews have inevitably stimulated Jewish nationalism, which, in the skilful hands of British imperialism, has found an outlet in zionism. British imperialism, far from being anti-semite as yet, still has a use for Jewish sentiment, of which it makes effective use against the Arabs in Palestine. In the meantime anti-semitism in Britain is confined to the propaganda of Mosley and other psychopaths.

British imperialism is able thus to exploit Jewish sentiment largely because of the confusion of thought among the Jews, and of the propaganda of powerful Jewish financial interests which are so closely identified with British capitalism as to have become indistinguishable.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Zionist confusion and zionist propaganda are both well-illustrated in *Thy Neighbour* by Lord Melchett. Lord Melchett is well qualified to write on zionism: he is one of its leading champions, and is also a son of the once notorious Sir Alfred Mond, founder of Imperial Chemical Industries. As he represents Jewish nationalist sentiment and British capitalist interests, his book is well worth studying by those who are puzzled by the causes and effects of zionism.

He writes sincerely enough on the history and suffering of the Jewish people, but then utilises that sentimental premise to justify zionism in identifying itself with British imperialism. Britain, "merciful, chivalrous," alone of nations holds out her hand "to help the weak, the scattered, the oppressed." A description of imperialist Britain which would hardly be confirmed by the Indians, Africans and, what is more to the point, by the Arabs, who, by the astute handling of Jewish sentiment by British imperialism, are threatened with the loss of their right to existence in Palestine. Lord Melchett, however, believes, and has written his book to show, that the destinies of British imperialism and the Jews are one and indivisible, a point of view which thousands of Jews have already repudiated by their actions. He further believes that British imperialism should be "requited" by the Jews for its merciful and chivalrous behaviour, and he devotes a whole chapter to the suggestions that Jewish gratitude should take the form of policing and guarding Palestine, which he rightly regards as one of the most important points of the British Empire. After pointing out the strategical and commercial importance of Palestine, he writes:

> If the Empire could rally an army of 500,000 Europeans at this vital point, whose very existence and that of their homes and families depended upon the preservation of the Empire, what a different outlook, what a change in the balance of power.

Such is the rôle which Lord Melchett and other zionist leaders intend for the thousands of Jewish victims of fascism. Struggling against one brand of fascism they are being deceived by a false nationalism into supporting another.

Apart from the alliance with British imperialism, Melchett advocates Jewish segregation:

> We *are* different, we *are* a separate people all over the world. We have chosen to be separate, perhaps because no one has yet offered us an example that we should care to follow.

The Jewish worker should consider this statement carefully. Has he really more in common with Lord Melchett, heir to the accumulated wealth of one of the biggest exploiters of Labour, than he has with the British worker? And as for the example to follow, it has not been provided by the Melchetts, Weizmanns, Ben Gurions and Jabotinskys, but by the Russian and Spanish workers and peasants and by the revolt against imperialism by the Arab masses.

LESTER HUTCHINSON.

ANCIENT GREEK MATERIALISM.

Les matérialistes de l'antiquité. Paul Nizan. Paris: Editions Sociales Internationales. 178 pp. 12fr.

IN 1841 Marx wrote a thesis for his doctorate on "The Differences between the Natural Philosophies of Democritus and Epicurus," which he described some years later as "an old work which properly belongs to a general study of Epicureanism, Stoicism and Scepticism—a task I am unable to contemplate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at present owing to preoccupation with political and philosophical work of a different kind." The thesis was first published in 1902 and republished by the Marx-Lenin Institute in 1926. It was immediately translated into French, but no English translation has yet appeared, and it has passed without notice in the placid pages of the *Classical Review*. In 1928, however, Dr. Cyril Bailey wrote a short critique of it in the *Classical Quarterly* (xxii. 205), in which he expressed his astonishment at the insight shown by Marx in penetrating behind the misrepresentations of Epicurus current in antiquity and glibly repeated by the scholars of his time.

Though still the most valuable study of the subject, it is, for Marx, an immature work, being concerned almost entirely with the intrinsic difference between the doctrines of the two philosophers and hardly at all with the economic developments which conditioned both. Guided by the principles enunciated by Marx himself in his later work, M. Nizan has attempted in this brief essay the task of expounding the work of Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius in relation to the general development of ancient society.

The collapse of Athenian democracy, in which the ancient slave-state had attained, on a scale necessarily minute, the highest point of its development, was followed by a period of violent disruption. Slavery rapidly increased—so rapidly that modern historians, like Beloch, have been tempted to tamper with the evidence ; wealth concentrated anew at one pole of society ; the free artisan, deprived of political rights, was condemned to poverty and emigration. Thus the Greek city-state paid the price for its exploitation of slave-labour in a succession of destructive wars and internal struggles—the helpless convulsions of a dying organism.

The philosophy of this period spoke with two voices. Plato and Aristotle, representing the ruling class, maintained their faith in society at the cost of defending an institution, which, as it continued to grow, became less and less defensible. Aristotle defended the subordination of slave to freeman by appealing to the doctrine, fundamental in his philosophy, of the subordination of body to soul, though in fact that doctrine was itself the ideological reflection of the division which confronted him in society ; and the flagrant inconsistencies inherent in his system are a measure of the extent to which the intellectual integrity of the privileged class was corrupted by defence of its privileges. On the other hand, the Cynics and Epicureans regarded all men as equal, but, since that equality was unattainable in contemporary society, they renounced their part in social life. Epicurus taught that the individual could only recover his lost security by cutting all social ties and abjuring all passions, all desires, except the satisfaction of material necessities.

His theory of the universe followed from his attitude to society. In the first place, he affirmed, against the idealists, the objective reality of the external world and the validity of sense-perception as a criterion of truth. In the second place, he ascribed the sole reality to the atoms, the indivisible units of which matter is composed, and to the void in which they move.

Parmenides, the forerunner of Plato, had taught that there was no empty space, and consequently no motion ; that the universe was one and unchanging, its apparent diversity and mutability being an illusion of the senses. Democritus, the forerunner of Epicurus, had reaffirmed the existence of empty space and attributed the properties of the Parmenidean One to each of an infinite number of atoms, indivisible, indestructible, without weight, falling vertically through the void and by their collisions and combinations creating the world. The result was a mechanical theory of the universe in which every event is the product of necessity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was the theory which Epicurus inherited and transformed. Endowed with the property of weight, the atom possesses in itself the cause of its own motion ; and it possesses, besides the vertical, an oblique motion, or swerve from the straight line. A vertically falling body is nothing more than a moving point, without autonomy or individuality, existing solely in relation to space. How was this relative existence to be negated ? Being embodied in the straight line or perpendicular fall, it was negated by ascribing to the atom another movement—the deviation from the straight line. Thus the atom was made autonomous. And so we arrive at a conception of the universe in which there is no providence, no destiny, only chance ; in which the soul of man and the gods themselves are fortuitous combinations of material particles ; in which prayer and sacrifice are futile, and justice is not a thing in itself but a social relation varying according to conditions. Mankind is an aggregate of individuals, each of whom, surrounded by an environment material and mortal like himself, has nothing to hope, nothing to fear, but can find the happiness of self-sufficiency in the satisfaction of his elementary needs. The negative character of this philosophy, in which pleasure is defined as the absence of pain, reflects the social desperation of the age ; its positive value lies in the conviction that the end of human endeavour is pleasure, and that the means to that end is the satisfaction of material needs.

Yet a man cannot live in solitude ; neither did the Epicureans. The Epicurean fraternities, which sprang out of the decay of family life and the city-state, were united on a basis of equality in the pursuit of the happiness of all their members. They were at the same time a pathetic recrudescence of those social ties which Epicurus had tried but failed to cut and an indication in miniature of what, when the motive of private gain had been eliminated, human society might become.

After the final dissolution of the city-states into the last phase of ancient society, the cosmopolitan empire, a new division emerged. While the Stoics preached the acceptance of society and the brotherhood of man, the impoverished masses, despairing of happiness in the present life, projected their frustrated hopes into the life to come.

M. Nizan does not deal fully with the problem of the relations between Democritus and Epicurus, but his essay provides a useful introduction to Marx's thesis. It is followed by a selection with explanatory notes of important passages from the writings of Epicurus and Lucretius.

G. T.

"A Godsend for Socialist Speakers"

was how the first edition of ARTHUR WOODBURN'S

"Plebs" Outline of Finance

was described. A revised and much enlarged edition is now ready

Paper Covers 2/6 (2/9 post free) *Cloth 3/6 (3/9 post free)*

Don't miss 'The Plebs' (3d.) the liveliest Marxist Monthly

N.C.L.C. Publishing Society Ltd., 15 South Hill Park Gardens, London, N.W.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COUNTRYSIDE SPEAKS.

Country Conditions. By Valentine Acland. Lawrence and Wishart. pp. 126. 2s.

PERHAPS nothing so clearly demonstrates the unevenness of the development of capitalism in such a complete way, as the decline of agriculture during the period of the rise of industry, until now people have almost forgotten that England has a basis for agriculture.

Lenin, referring to this question in his work *Imperialism: The Last Stage of Capitalism*, writes:

> . . . . if capitalism could develop agriculture. . . . if it could raise the standard of living of the masses. . . . But in that case capitalism would not be capitalism, for the inequalities of development and the wretched conditions of the masses are the indispensable conditions, the very roots of this method of production. (p. 57. Little Lenin Library edition).

Agriculture has shared in the general capitalist crisis and the numerous subsidies, quotas and Marketing Boards have been produced as a way out. These temporary triumphs of the big farmer are proving the demise of the small farmer and the farm worker. In fact, the glorious English countryside, a great potential bearer of wealth, is going to rot and with it those who should be its immediate natural inheritors. To-day even less land is under the plough.

Down the byways and villages of the countryside, the ravages of the capitalist system have been no less felt than elsewhere. Unemployment, widespread poverty with low wages, have produced weakly children and generally low living conditions; and no less significant, the depopulation of villages.

Miss Acland allows the country people to speak these truths, in simple yet striking fashion, in her book. One might say that here are the plain facts. Serious facts.

A reconstructed Workers' Britain would have to put an end to that fraudulent dictum—"England is an industrial country"—as though our business lay in factories only and not in the fields. We should need the support of the small farmer and of the farm worker. To-day, everything suggests that both town and country are entering the hungry "1940's." This book proves it for the country. It is sufficient to whet our appetites and make them keener for more Socialist books about agriculture and its workers, and so help to forge a unity between town and country.

A. J. W.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

A Survey of a South Indian Village. N. S. Subramanian. (All India Congress Committee, Allahabad, India.) 13 pp. No price.

The New Social Order in China. T'ang Leang-li. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.) 282 pp. 10s.

China's New Currency System. Dr. H. H. Kung. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.) 138 pp. 7s. 6d.

Economic Developments in Victorian Scotland. W. H. Marwick, M.A. (Allen & Unwin.) 291 pp. 12s. 6d.

The British Empire. Johannes Stoye. (John Lane.) 344 pp. 12s. 6d.

The Training of Pioneers. Leslie Paul. (National Council, Woodcraft Folk.) 46 pp. 6d.

We're Not Going to do Nothing. A reply to Aldous Huxley. C. Day Lewis. Left Review Pamphlet. 29 pp. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Report of a Commission into Certain Disturbances at Thurloe Square, South Kensington, on March 22nd, 1936. (National Council for Civil Liberties.) 29 pp. 6d.

Pillars of Cloud. John Scanlon. (Chapman & Hall Ltd.) 320 pp. 5s.

Behind the Spanish Barricades. John Langdon Davies. (Martin Secker & Warburg.) 302 pp. 12s. 6d.

The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists. Robert Tressall. Dramatised Version: Tom Thomas. (The Richards Press.) 89 pp. 2s. 6d.

British Imperialism in Ireland. H. Sheehy-Skeffington. (Co-op. Press, 7 Belgrave Road, Rathmines, Dublin.) 28 pp. 2d.

For a Brighter and Happier Glasgow: A Real Live Municipal Programme. Communist Party of Great Britain (Glasgow Committee). pp. 16. 1d.

New London. Ted Bramley. Communist Party of Great Britain (London District Committee). 133 East Rd, N.1. pp. 59. 2d.

The People Can Save South Wales. Idris Cox. (Communist Party.) 23 pp. 1d.

Labouring Life in Norfolk Villages, 1824-1914. L. Marion Springall. (Allen and Unwin.) pp. 158. 5s.

Consumption and Standards of Living. Carle C. Zimmerman. (Williams and Norgate.) pp. 599. 16s.

Espagne, Espagne! Jean-Richard Bloch. pp. 263. 12f. *Panorama de L'Amerique Latine.* Renaud de Jouvenel. pp. 176. 10f. *La Remise des Cailles.* Georges David. pp. 181. 10f. (Editions Sociales Internationales, Paris.) Obtainable through Workers' Bookshops.

● *Become a regular subscriber to the*

DAILY WORKER

The **LEADING** Newspaper on Spain and the depressed areas

7d. per week from the "DAILY WORKER," NELSON PLACE, CAYTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.1, and from numerous newsagents everywhere

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parliamentary and Local Government Elections. William E. Eyles. (Pitman.) pp. 170. 5s.

Only Yesterday : A Play in Three Acts. Adrian Brunel. (George Newnes Ltd.) pp. 112. 2s. 6d.

The European Civil War : The First Twenty Years, 1927-1936. Scott Nearing. pp. 20.

Industrial Employment and Unemployment in West Yorkshire. J. Henry Richardson, M.A., Ph. D. (Allen and Unwin.) pp. 142. 6s.

Abolish Slumps. A. W. Knight. (P. S. King & Son.) pp. 142. 6s.

Cabinet Government. W. Ivor Jennings. (Cambridge University Press.) pp. 484. 21s.

A Plan for Lasting Peace in Palestine. Nevill Barbour. (Syrian Orphanage Press, Jerusalem.) pp. 41. 50mill.

Spain's Challenge to Labour. H. N. Brailsford. (The Socialist League.) pp. 12. 1d.

The Novel To-day. Philip Henderson. (John Lane.) pp. 312. 7s. 6d.

Eugene Pottier et "L'Internationale." Alexandre Zevaes. pp. 62. (No price stated.) *Au Nom de la Loi.* Stefan Priacel. pp. 256. 12f. (Editions Sociales Internationales, Paris). Obtainable through Workers' Bookshops.

The Moral Case for Free Trade. C. J. L. Brock. (Cobden-Sanderson.) pp. 27. 6d.

Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx. Karl Kautsky. (N.C.L.C.) pp. 252. 2s. 6d.

Art and Society : A Marxist Analysis. George V. Plekhanov. (Critics Group, New York. Collet's, London.) pp. 94. 1s. 6d.

The Adventures of the Little Pig. pp. 63. *The Enchanted Fishes and other Stories.* F. Le Gros and Ida Clark. pp. 61. Nos. 1 and 2 of the Little Leopard Books. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 6d. each.

Good-Bye Twilight : Songs of the Irish Struggle. 40 Irish Poets. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) pp. 104. 2s. 6d.

Elementary Economics. (Collet's Bookshop.) pp. 16. 1d.

Clean up the Factories. J. L. Douglas. pp. 10. 1d. *An A.1 Nation.* Joe Goss. pp. 9. 1d. *Give us Jobs.* David Burke. pp. 10. 1d. Nos. 1, 2 and 3, The Youth Library. (Young Communist League.)

Spain : The Visit of an All-Party Group of Members of Parliament to Spain. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 15 pp. 3d.

Japan at the Crossroads. Walter Smith. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 125 pp. 3s. 6d.

Hitler and the Empire. James Turner. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 40 pp. 6d.

Labour in the Land of Socialism. Stakanovites in Conference. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 239 pp. 3s. 6d.

The New Democracy. Stalin's Speech on the New Constitution. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 30 pp. 6d.

Women Who Work. Joan Beauchamp. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 104 pp. 2s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Financial Appeal

READERS will notice from the list of acknowledgments that the appeal specially made to new readers over the last two months has met with quite a considerable response to the Guarantee Fund as well as to the Debt Fund. The result is that practically the whole of this month's donations amounting to £20 9s. 7d. is available to reduce the accumulated debt.

It was stated last month that the amount of this Debt was still in the neighbourhood of £250. In consequence of this month's total of the proceeds from the increasing circulation, that produces a surplus to bare expenditure, the Debt is now not much more than £200.

If every reader continues to support the MONTHLY to the utmost in relation to other commitments, it should be possible to announce next month that the Debt figure has definitely been brought below the £200 level. This will bring the MONTHLY within sight of being able to consider plans for a great extension of sales by means of increased expenditure on publicity and advertising, which we have hitherto felt, owing to the existing debt, that we have been hampered from doing except to a very limited extent.

As " A Canadian," in forwarding his generous donation, has put it :

> The main thing is to increase the Debt Fund.

Another £1 donator in an accompanying note, writes :

> I rejoice with you at the rise in circulation. If ever a message is needed to-day, it is surely that which the LABOUR MONTHLY is giving its readers.

Let every effort be made so that the early months of 1937 will mark not only the complete liquidation of the Debt, but will, by means of the Guarantee Fund, ensure the future continuance of the journal.

We can then feel free to launch out on our big advertising and publicity campaign, so that the MONTHLY can shortly become self-supporting.

Do not hesitate. Turn over the page and fill in the form to be found there.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEBT FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	94	0	7
J. J. Christie, Banbury, Oxon.	0	3	0
J. Creidenberg, New York, U.S.A.	0	4	0
"Scot"	1	0	0
F. Bosazza, South Africa	0	3	6
Joan Findlay, South Africa	1	0	0
Lionel Phillips, Edinburgh	0	1	6
S. W. C. Phillips, Hull ..	0	10	6
"Hastings"	0	10	0
W. Cormack, Edinburgh ..	2	0	0
Mrs. A. Winsloe, London, W.	0	2	0
Carried forward ..	£99	15	1

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward ..	99	15	1
D. M. Gorman, Hants. ..	0	14	0
F. Knowles, B.C., Canada	0	4	2
J. T. Pound, London, W. ..	0	1	0
W.T., Saskatchewan, Canada	0	4	5
F.B., East Grinstead ..	1	0	0
Anon., Prescot	1	0	0
A. Rochester, N.Y., U.S.A.	0	4	0
Mrs. J. Peterson, London, W.	1	0	0
A Canadian	10	0	0
Proceeds of Sales per F.W.B.	0	7	6
	£114	10	2

GUARANTEE FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	18	9	7
F. Bradley, Gainsborough	0	2	6
Anon., Prescot	1	0	0
D., Northern Rhodesia	0	2	6
"Doe"	0	2	6
	£19	17	1

In addition 2s. has been received from X.Y.Z. for the Guarantee Fund.

To the Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

**In response to your appeal I enclose herewith the sum of ..... as a contribution to the* LABOUR MONTHLY *Debt Fund.*

**I promise to send the sum of ..... monthly to the Guarantee Fund until further notice and enclose a first instalment of .....*

*Strike out whichever sentence does not apply.

Name .....

Address .....

Date ....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1937 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 270 Broadway, Suite 1401, New York City, U.S.A.

South African Representative :—I. Wolfson, P.O. Box 5457, Johannesburg, Transvaal, South Africa.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 49 Farringdon Road, E.C.1.

Advertisement Rates : £8 8s. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 5s. od. per page (ordinary position) and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 5s. od.	*Volume X*	£1 10s. od.
Volume II	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XI*	£1 1s. od.
Volume III	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XII*	15s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XIII*	15s. 6d.
Volume V	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XVI*	10s. 6d.
Volume VIII	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XVII*	10s. 6d.
Volume IX	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XVIII*	10s. 6d.

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue except for 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

En Passant . . .

May we remind you that the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society, equipped with four spacious factories, up-to-the-minute machinery and skilled craftsmen, is always at your service. For a considerable number of years this firm has been the "pantheon" of everything appertaining to the art of Printing, and now, combined with departments for Box-making and Stationery, is capable of undertaking work of every description. No order is too small or too large but that it will receive our utmost attention—and at the right price.

The Sign of Quality

Leicester
Co-operative Printing Society Ltd.

LEICESTER : HEAD OFFICE, CHURCH GATE

BOX FACTORY : BRITON STREET, LEICESTER

LONDON : 58 GOUGH STREET, W.C.1 KETTERING : 24 KING STREET

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Church Gate, Leicester.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED